The Genesis and Reception of Robert Schumann’s Kerner Liederreihe, Op. 35

Robert Joseph Gennaro

A dissertation submitted to the faculty of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the Department of Music.

Chapel Hill
2009

Approved by:
Jon W. Finson
Mark Evan Bonds
Tim Carter
Annegret Fauser
Jocelyn Neal
ABSTRACT


(Under the direction of Jon W. Finson)

Robert Schumann’s Zwölf Gedichte von Justinus Kerner: Eine Liederreihe, op. 35 (1840), represents the composer’s final song cycle from his Liederjahr, and it stands as one of his three contributions to the nineteenth-century Wanderlieder tradition (the others being op. 36 and op. 39). While multiple comprehensive studies address several of Schumann’s song cycles (opp. 39, 42, and 48), op. 35 has not received the same amount of attention from musicologists. One of the reasons for this, according to Barbara Turchin, is the misunderstanding of op. 35’s poetic theme and musical substance. The Kerner Liederreihe lacks the kind of teleological narrative found in Dichterliebe and Frauenliebe und Leben. But there may be more important questions surrounding op. 35 than tightly-knit narrative progression.

My study places op. 35 in the context of the loosely-knit nineteenth-century Wanderlieder cycle by tracing its history from genesis through critical reception. I examine the process by which Schumann composed these songs, from his selection of Kerner’s verse to the chronology of composition, realization in the Berlin Liederbücher, and organization in the first edition print. Although there are no known sketches for op. 35, we can compare the layers of the autograph realization to study Schumann’s compositional process. In the final two chapters I examine the publication and reception history of op. 35, noting the way in
which Schumann divided the cycle into volumes and how writers have assessed the result, from the earliest known review to the most recent studies by current musicologists. In general, we find that Schumann tried to bring tonal and narrative order to the opus in a loose sense, a phenomenon in which writers (including this one) have become increasingly interested.
To my family—all past and present. And to Mireille for her love and continuous support of me in all things.
PREFACE

This dissertation stems almost entirely from Jon Finson’s graduate seminar in spring 2002 on “Schumann and the Ballad,” in which we studied examples of this genre from the first half of the nineteenth century. We focused not only on identifying songs that fit within the context of the German ballad, but also on an introduction (in great detail) to issues of declaiming text, to Schumann’s interest in various poets, and to some of the lesser known numbers from Schumann’s cycles and collections. Among the works we were introduced to was “Stirb, Lieb’ und Freud’!,” which stands as the second number from Schumann’s Kerner Liederreihe, op 35, and part of the final cycle Schumann composed during his Liederjahr. This lone song spurred my interest in the other numbers in the opus, in their music, in scholarly responses to them, and eventually, in writing this dissertation.

In approaching op. 35, we are faced with several tasks not unlike other cycles from Schumann’s oeuvre. At the outset of any study of the composer’s songs lies a matter of text selection. Why did Schumann select a particular verse for setting? Was it a matter of the poem’s mechanics, content, or a combination of the two? And in the case of cycles where there is an issue of narrative, how do his selections of texts, in many cases from disparate portions of a poetic collection, relate to one another? The latter question has been examined by numerous musicologists with regard to Schumann’s well-known song cycles (Dichterliebe, Frauenliebe und Leben, and the Heine Liederkreis). But for op. 35, much of the scholarly work on the cycle seems to question Schumann’s selection of Kerner’s verse,
and scholars intimate that his choices comprise nothing more than a random assortment. The first part of my dissertation will assess Schumann selections of Kerner’s poetry for op. 35 on the basis of poetic content, meaning, and metrical design, and I will also discuss how he declaimed text. Based on these studies, I put forth some theories as to how Schumann might have proceeded to organize these texts into a more teleological design in later chapters. I also explore the composer’s early interests in setting Kerner’s poetry, since he represented Schumann’s favorite choice as a young song composer.

Next I turn to Schumann’s settings. The manner in which Schumann went about composing Lieder has been noted by various scholars, such as Rufus Hallmark. The composer was very consistent in his manner of fashioning songs: he produced melodic sketches first and then drafted both melody and piano accompaniment together. This latter step for all of the Kerner songs Schumann composed at the end of 1840 appears in the third volume of the Berlin Liederbücher, a manuscript in which the composer entered many of his songs in full realizations that eventually serve as the basis for later fair copies. Even though melodic sketches for op. 35 no longer exist, the Liederbücher allow us to see how Schumann worked when we compare his first layer of entry (where he transferred the melody from sketches) in one shade of ink, to secondary layers (revisions to melody, accompaniment, or copying errors), made in another shade. In this chapter I analyze all of the revisions Schumann produced in the Berlin drafts as he realized the Kerner songs, and I also trace the variants between the autograph and the first edition versions in order to show the layers of compositional decisions the composer made.

While the manner in which Schumann composed the songs in manuscript reveals much about op. 35, it only marks the beginning of many important issues as to how the
composer arrived at his final product. At the fore of this discussion is the final arrangement of the songs into a *Liederreihe*, its publication in two uneven volumes of five and seven songs, and omission of two numbers entered in the Berlin piano drafts. I explore how Schumann might have arrived at the greater narrative and tonal designs of the cycle, as he organized the songs into the final *Liederreihe*. My final chapter assesses critical reaction to op. 35—from the initial writings of nineteenth-century writers up to the present day—as I investigate the variety of responses to Kerner’s poetry, to Schumann’s treatment of the poet’s verse, to questions of cyclicity in the collection, and to how this opus stands among Schumann’s other notable song cycles.

I would like to thank my advisor, Jon W. Finson, for his guidance, continuous help, and keen interest in seeing me through this dissertation. I am truly indebted to all of his advice—both scholarly and in many ways, fatherly—throughout this entire process. In addition, special thanks goes to the members of my committee who have aided in the completion of this dissertation, and provided assistance to me both inside and outside of the classroom.

I would like to thank my parents and Mireille for all of the love and support they have continued to provide to me throughout this entire dissertation. And finally, my grandmother Maria Neuhaus deserves a special mention for all of her guidance in helping me translate various German documents.
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LbIII Liederbuch III, autograph drafts of op. 35, Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin, Preußischer Kulturbesitz, Mus. ms. autogr. 16.


Chapter I: Selection of Texts, Declamation, and Subject Matter

Robert Schumann’s formative years (1810-28) were important in the development of his talents for both piano and voice. As early as age seven, Schumann’s frequent singing alerted his parents to their son’s musical talent.¹ He then began piano lessons with Johann Gottfried Kuntsch, the organist at Saint Mary’s, Zwikau. This led to his initial attempts at composition for the keyboard in the form of dances (lost). A further influence for Schumann came in 1818 when he traveled with his mother to Carlsbad and met pianist Ignaz Moscheles. Although he entered the Zwikau Gymnasium in 1819 or 1820, Schumann continued his musical studies and eventually made his first appearance as a pianist in 1821 through a series of performances arranged by Kuntsch of variation sets by Pleyel, Ries, Cramer, Weber and Moscheles. From his teenage years he also produced a number of compositions, most notably his setting of Psalm 150 for soprano, alto, and orchestral accompaniment in 1822. This was followed by another try at the genre of the oratorio in Ouverture and Chor von Landleuten from 1822 or 1823.²

Schumann’s early interests were not limited to music, however. As the son of a lexicographer and book dealer, he was introduced to many classics of literature and eventually began to assemble his own literary works in a book entitled Blätter und Blümchen aus der goldenen Aue, a series of poetic and biographical sketches of famous composers. By

² Ibid., 23.
age fifteen, he would become involved with a group of fellow students in a “Literarischer Verein” in which they discussed readings from German literature and their own original works. From 1825-1828 this group provided the young composer a venue in which he became familiar with the works of Schiller, Schlegel, and Herder. Schumann also began to produce translations of Greek and Latin verse by Homer, Sophocles, and Anakreon in his *Idyllen aus dem Griechischen des Bion, Theocritus und Moschus*.

In spite of Schumann’s literary activities, it is difficult to say whether music or letters were more important to him in his mid-teens, according to John Daverio.³ During the young composer’s involvement with the literary “Verein,” he also became acquainted with Beethoven’s string quartets, Haydn’s keyboard music and Mozart’s operas. It is not surprising, then, that some of his earliest musical compositions came in the form of *Lieder*, considering his preoccupation with both music and literature. From the summers of 1827 and 1828, Schumann set verse by Goethe, Byron, Jacobi, Schulze, Kerner, as well as his own poetry. In all, thirteen songs from this period stand as his first extant works in a “polished musical idiom.”⁴

While the seeds of music and literature were planted during Schumann’s earliest compositional attempts, it seems unusual that he apparently abandoned writing *Lieder* until his 1840 *Liederjahr*. This was due to his resolution to pursue instrumental music fully after the conclusion of his law studies in Heidelberg during the summer of 1830 when he decided to resume his lessons with Friedrich Wieck and planned to spend a year in Vienna studying with Moscheles. The vast majority of his compositional output came in the form of sketches (or drafts) for several string quartets, a symphony and piano concertos and two completed

³ Ibid., 29.

⁴ Ibid., 33.
movements of a symphony. For the next decade his efforts turned to writing for the piano, and during this time he produced some of his most important keyboard works: the *ABEGG* Variations (op. 1), *Papillons* (op. 2), the *Toccata* (op. 7), *Carnival* (op. 9), the *Etudes Symphoniques* (op. 13) and two piano sonatas, opp. 11 and 22.

Schumann eventually settled in Wieck’s Leipzig home during the fall of 1830 but soon became frustrated with his studies due to the latter’s interests in promoting the career of his daughter, Clara. Shortly thereafter, Schumann began a course of formal compositional training (the first and only time in his life he would do so) with Heinrich Dorn, conductor of the Leipzig theater. Dorn’s teachings would ignite a passion for counterpoint in Schumann that would remain with him for the rest of his career.5 Another important development during this time was Schumann’s gradual interest in musical criticism. His introduction to the works of E.T.A. Hoffmann’s writings eventually led to a partnership that he had desired since his youth as, a “poetically inclined musician and a musically informed critic.”6 Schumann’s vision came to fruition in 1834 with the *Neue Zeitschrift für Musik* under his editorship. This, coupled with an injury to the middle finger of his right hand likely due to his use of a chiroplast, turned his attention more towards composing.

**The Early Songs**

Aside from the numerous works for piano Schumann wrote during the 1830s, the thirteen songs composed during 1827-28 seem to represent the genre in which he focused most extensively during his early years. The possibility of producing compositions that combined his two chief interests, music and literature, was no doubt compelling. Another factor might

5 Ibid., 70.

6 Ibid.
also have been his encounter with singer, Agnes Carus, for whom he had a frustrated romantic interest. Schumann wrote in his diary on 14 August 1828 that his songs “were intended as an actual reproduction of my inner self; but no human being can present something exactly as the genius creates it; even she [Agnus Carus] sang the most beautiful passages badly and didn’t understand me.”

In all, Schumann composed four songs during the summer of 1827 (“Sehnsucht,” “Die Weinende,” “Verwandlung,” and “Lied für XXX”), and another eight during the next summer (“Kurzes Erwachen,” Gesanges Erwachen,” “An Anna I, II,” “Hirtenknabe,” “Der Fischer,” and “Klage”). Yet another setting, “Im Herbste,” bearing no date, also appears among these early songs.

Schumann’s early songs offer an interesting template for stylistic possibilities that the composer would continue to develop in later years. They would also provide musical ideas for some of his piano music of the next decade: “An Anna II” provides material in the Aria for the second movement of the Piano Sonata op. 11, and “Im Herbste” in the Andantino of the Piano Sonata op. 22. One of the qualities immediately apparent in these works is Schumann’s penchant for beginning a song with the accompaniment in a key other than the tonic. This is most apparent in “Sehnsucht,” where the piano begins in E minor before giving way to the actual tonic, D major. Schumann uses similar techniques to begin “Erinnerung,” “Die Weinende,” and “Gesanges Erwachen.” Also prevalent in these songs are melodies for the voice that have little to do with the prelude. This is evident in “Sehnsucht,” where the dotted rhythms of the introduction lead to a flowing melody accompanied by steady sextuplets. For “An Anna II” and “Im Herbste” the introduction plays no role whatsoever.

---

7 Ibid., 30.

8 Of the thirteen songs, only eleven are published. “Verwandlung,” (text by Schulze) from Zwei Jugendlieder is the first and “Klage,” (Jacobi) exists only as a fragment.
since the piano merely serves as a brief preface to the melody.\(^9\)

Although Schumann’s early songs display stylistic presentiments of later songs in their manner of beginning, the same cannot be said about the way they concluded. While later cycles such as *Dichterliebe* and *Frauenliebe und Leben* contain postludes for the piano that play important roles in the songs, the early works do not include such sections. On the whole, the early songs feature one- or two-bar postludes that very rarely reiterate any of the melodic material in the body of the song. Such an example is found in “An Anna I,” where the piano merely concludes with trills. Even in songs where melodic material is present in the postlude, as in “Kurzes Erwachen,” the coda is concise and quickly leads to the final cadence.

Regarding the composition of *Lieder* in August 1828, Schumann wrote that “song unites the highest things, word and tone, the latter an inarticulate letter in the alphabet of humanity; it is purely extracted quintessence of the spiritual life.”\(^10\) With this sentiment in mind, it is not surprising that the composer turned to Justinus Kerner for many of his early settings (five of thirteen). In a letter to the Kapellmeister of Brunswick, Gottlob Wiedebein, on 15 July 1828, Schumann wrote, “Kerner’s poems which attracted me the most were those of mysterious and supernatural powers, also found in the poetry of Goethe and Jean Paul; they brought me first to the realization to try to define a celestial tone for each word.”\(^11\)

Perhaps Schumann’s recognition of Kerner’s verse as “mysterious and supernatural” stemmed from the various ways the poet employed nature and its phenomena to symbolize


\(^10\) Ibid., 30.

human emotion. We find this, for instance, in “Kurzes Erwachen,” where the persona equates the singing of a bird to the piercing of his heart; however, once that song fades, the month of May vanishes all around him. This association also occurs in “Im Herbst,” where the persona wishes the sun, flowers, and birds to depart so that he alone may sing to his beloved. Kerner’s verse also touches on the supernatural in his *Episteln*, where the lover Andreas alludes to a pale messenger who will soon lead him to unearthly realms.

**Justinus Kerner**

Since Schumann’s affinity for Kerner’s poetry persisted in subsequent compositional periods, we might ask more about the individual who was an important literary influence for the composer throughout his life, yet remains a less distinguished author than Heine, Goethe, Eichendorff and Rückert. Justinus Kerner’s pursuits were quite eclectic: in addition to writing poetry he practiced medicine, studied paranormal phenomena, and produced a number of historical studies about Württemberg. Together with fellow poets Ludwig Uhland, and Gustav Schwab, Kerner belonged to an important trio of Swabian authors who penned much lyrical poetry. Born Justinus Andreas Christian Kerner (18 September 1786) in Ludwigsburg, he was the sixth and youngest child of a senior civil servant. Kerner received his initial education in the classical schools of Ludwigsburg and Maulbroon and was eventually apprenticed at a cloth mill. After his father’s death in 1799, he began studies at the University of Tübingen in 1804, where he received some of his first instruction in modern literature.

---

12 I have based much of the following biography on Otto-Joachim Grüsser’s *Justinus Kerner, 1786-1862: Arzt-Poet-Geisterseher* (Berlin, 1987).

from Carl Phillip Conz, a professor of classical philology. While his primary focus was medicine, Kerner increasingly began to pursue his literary interests, which were influenced by Conz, who provided him with some of his earliest knowledge of German authors such as Schiller, Klopstock, Hölty and Matthison. Conz not only educated Kerner in the arts but also saw to his young pupil’s studies in religion as well, which led to latter’s confirmation as a Roman Catholic in 1802.

Kerner’s studies in Tübingen also led him to associations with fellow poets Ludwig Uhland, Karl Mayer, Varnhagen von Ense, Gustav Schwab, and Heinrich Köstlin. While still a student of medicine, Kerner published his first poems in 1807 in Seckendorf’s Musenalmanach. Upon graduating in 1808, he continued to pursue his literary interests through a series of trips to Hamburg and Berlin, where he met the likes of Chamisso, Schlegel and Foqué. He would eventually settle in Wilbad in 1810-1818, during which time he established his own medical practice. Kerner remained there until he was appointed Oberamtsarzt (district medical officer), and he transferred in 1818 to Weinsberg, where he was to spend the rest of his life.

Although his medical career flourished, Kerner continued to write lyrical poetry and short stories. In 1811 he published a humorous autobiographical series in his Reiseschatten von dem Schattenspieler Luchs. His association with Schwab and Uhland also continued when the trio collaborated on the Poetischer Almanach for 1812 and the Deutscher Dichterwald from 1813. During this same year Kerner also completed one of his first accounts dealing with mysticism: Das Wildbad im Königreich Württemberg, a portrayal of

14 Grüsser, Justinus Kerner, 21.
Wilbald’s healing waters. In the following years Kerner’s attention turned towards writing satirical essays regarding the constitutional disputes in Württemburg. His narratives Die Heimatlosen and Der rasende Sandler, from 1816 and 1817 respectively, were two of his more influential works regarding internal political struggles of the time.

During the next decade Kerner continued to balance his poetic and medical publications. This period also saw his exploration of more mystical topics in both areas. In 1822 he produced a treatise about animal magnetism and the effect of acids on animal organisms, Das Fettgift oder die Fettsäure und ihre Wirkung auf den tierischen Organismus. This was followed by another work that dealt with memory and with the effects of medical mysticism in psychology. On the literary side Kerner produced narratives concerning humans and the “spirit world” in his Die Seherin von Prevorst (1829) and in Eröffnungen über das innere Leben der Menschen und über das Hereinragen einer Geisterwelt in die unsere (1829). His first comprehensive volume of poetry appeared in 1826 as collected Gedichte, the poet’s central anthology of verse. This volume extended to a further edition in Die Dichtungen from 1834. In subsequent years, Kerner’s Der letzte Blütenstrauß (1852), would also appear. However, Schumann only used two collections for the composition of his Lieder, the anthologies of 1826 and 1834.

In the following years Kerner returned to two forms in which he had previously published. He continued to write in a satirical vein with a dramatic farce, Der Bärenhäuter im Salzbande (1835) and he also produced a handful of historical narratives, one of which was an autobiographical account of his youthful years from 1786 to 1804 entitled Bilderbuch aus meiner Knabenzeit (1840). He would later pen an account of Franz Anton Mesmer’s
dealings with animal magnetism in *Franz Anton Mesmer aus Schwaben: Entdecker des thierischen Magnetismus* in 1856.

**Schumann’s First Kerner Songs**

Schumann drew the early Kerner *Lieder* from a volume of the poet’s *Gedichte* of 1826, selecting three individual poems (“Kurzes Erwachen,” “Gesanges Erwachen,” and “Im Herbste”) and two from a six-poem sequence entitled “Episteln” (“An Anna I and II”), consisting of a series of letters sent from Andreas to his beloved Anna. Although these various selections were drawn from different portions of the volume, there is evidence that Schumann likely chose them carefully since they are so similar in their poetic content.

While the poetic connections of “An Anna I and II” would appear obvious, the three individually selected poems also show common themes. Beginning with “Kurzes Erwachen,” a persona, sunk in grief, sets out in the month of May and hears a birdsong in the spring forest. It pierces his heart so, that when it fades, May has vanished all around him. “Gesanges Erwachen” also depicts a heart-broken individual who wishes to sing again if he could only recover from his melancholy. But his lips are mute and can do little more than whimper, like a bird’s song on a winter’s day. He compares a bright dream that only lightened his spirits for a moment to the sun’s rays that withdraw when doused by rain. In “Im Herbste,” a persona wishes the sun away, so he alone may warm his beloved. He then desires the flowers to wilt and the birds to cease their song, in order that he may sing to her and bloom in doing so.

The six “Episteln” deal with the subject of love from a distance, as Anna awaits for a sign from her beloved Andreas, who is away at war. While the first five poems speak from the latter’s point of view, not until the sixth does Anna gain her voice after Andreas has been killed on the battlefield. But there is a final cruel twist here: Anna herself is dead. In the
conclusion of the series, she awaits her groom as his bride on the “other side.” Of the six
poems, Schumann chose to set the first and fifth from the sequence. In the first, Andreas
dreams that he can see Anna’s house from his seat on a mountain. He describes the scene as
birds pass close to her and perch atop her roof, and the moon then rises to gaze into her blue
eyes. Yet Andreas stands far away and alone in this vision, lamenting that he has no wings to
fly to her nor any light to beam upon her. The second poem alludes to Andreas’ death on the
battlefield. Since all his friends have fallen, the pale messenger soon will come to lead him to
his sweet homeland.

In the five texts Schumann selected from Kerner we find several literary topoi. First,
there is a strong notion of lost love or love never attained. Kerner’s verse characterizes this in
various ways, but usually through nature. In the examples above it is apparent that nature
refers in many instances to certain pleasures that summon reminiscence. In others, nature
symbolizes ways in which the persona would like his beloved (or perhaps himself) to feel.
There is also a strong sense of reflection in all of these texts, where the persona considers its
effects on his life. Daverio suggests that the early songs emerged “at some level, from the
interaction of personal and artistic concerns.”16 Schumann’s interest in the singer Agnes
Carus suggests that the Kerner settings present autobiographical reflections.

While the literary topoi in the Kerner texts Schumann chose display many
similarities, his approach to them varies. This may result partly from the fact that of the five
poems selected, only two share identical meters. The settings do share one formal trait: all
but one are strophic or modified strophic settings. An individual examination of each song
provides a glimpse into Schumann’s early habits of setting verse, in particular, how he
declared text and handled certain nuances of poetic lines.

16 Daverio, New Poetic Age, 30.
Ich bin im Mai gegangen
Und hab es nicht gewußt,
Also vom Schmerz befangen
Ist die erkrankte Brust.

Ein Vogel hat gesungen
Im jungbelaubten Wald,
Da ist in’s Herz gedrungen
Mir seine Stimme bald.

Vom Aug’ ist mir gefallen
Ein schwerer Thränen-Thau,
Drauf sah den May ich wallen
Durch Erd’ und Himmel blau.

Als Vogel ausgesungen
Flog er in’s weite Land,
Und wie sein Lied verklungen,
Um mich der May verschwand.

Schumann’s setting of this text highlights the poet’s use of Langzeilenvers, a poetic meter using iambic tetrameter, with the last two syllables of odd-numbered lines both receiving accents and with every second line ending in a silent foot. This form of verse combines with cross rhyme (ABAB), to form quatrains. “Kurzes Erwachen” has four stanzas using this scheme. Schumann’s setting combines the first two lines of the stanza in a four-bar phrase, followed by the same treatment for the next two lines. While this is a common approach to setting verse during this period, the actual declamation of the text is another matter.

Schumann clearly preserves the poetic meter of the first two lines in “Kurzes Erwachen” by this means. He sets the song in a compound meter (6/4), which allows for the

---

17 The text to “Kurzes Erwachen,” and all Schumann’s early songs comes from Helmut Schanze and Krishan Shulte, Literarische Vorlagen der ein- und mehrstimmigen Lieder. Gesänge und Deklamationen, in Robert Schumann: Neue Ausgabe sämtlicher Werke. Series 8, vol. 2 (Mainz, 2002), 252-55. All translations unless otherwise noted are mine.

18 For a discussion of German poetic forms, see Otto Paul, Deutsche Metrik (Munich, 1970).
proper iambic scansion of the poetry (see ex. 1.1). The next two lines, however, begin on the downbeat, and the natural accents from the meter is lost as we find in example 1.2. Schumann sets the next two stanzas to the same music, thus repeating the pattern. Significantly, the accompaniment reinforces the vocal melody’s declamation in both cases. In the first example, the piano emphasizes the strong beats to enhance the exact places where the strong accents fall. In the second, the accompaniment doubles the melodic line of the voice.

Example 1.1: mm. 1-4, “Kurzes Erwachen”

Example 1.2: mm. 6-9, “Kurzes Erwachen”

The final stanza appears as a coda both harmonically and melodically. Schumann resolves the harmony to the tonic D-flat major, after he presents the first three verses centered on an A-flat tonality. The melodic content of the coda is presented with phrases that...
combine the techniques used from the preceding stanzas, alternating between strict and less strict metrical declamation.

“Gesanges Erwachen”19

Könnt’ ich einmal wieder singen,
Wär’ ich wiederum gesund,
Aber noch will’s Herz zerspringen
Und in Trauern schweigt der Mund.
Kaum, daß diese leise Klage
Aus dem vollen Busen drang,
Wie an einem Wintertage
Oft schon halb ein Vogel sang.
Wie aus Wolken eng verschlossen
Halb oft dringt ein Sonnenblick,
Bald von Regen übergossen,
Wiederkehrt in sich zurück.
Also hellte mein Gemüthe
Ach nur kurz ein lichter Traum,
Und vom aufgeweckten Liede
Hallten diese Töne kaum.

If I could only sing once more
I would be well again,
But my heart is still breaking
And lips mute with grief.
Scarcely, this lament cried
From my full bosom,
As a bird would often sing
On a winter’s day.
Just as the tightly gathered clouds
Are pierced by the sun’s rays,
They quickly withdraw,
When doused with rain.
And so a bright dream;
Did so briefly lighten my spirit,
And the songs that awoke
Could scarcely be heard.

Even though “Gesanges Erwachen” appears as a single stanza of sixteen lines in Kerner’s Gedichte, Schumann divides the poem into four equal parts to fit his formal scheme. His approach to this text is quite similar to that of “Kurzes Erwachen” in that he sets the first three stanzas to the same music followed by a fourth that slightly modifies the melody. The major difference between the two songs, however, lies in the fact that the declamation of the text in “Gesanges Erwachen” never deviates from the poetic meter: trochaic tetrameter.

Schumann uses a motive from the introductory measures in the accompaniment, in the form of a falling triplet on an upbeat, to prepare the downbeats of the melodic line firmly.

The final stanza of the poem differs melodically from the preceding three and Schumann interrupts the continuity of the vocal line with interludes from the piano, which in turn replace the voice. This is most prominent in mm. 24 and 26 where the singer repeats

19 Schanze and Schulte, Literarische Vorlager, 253.
“Ach! nur kurz” three times to emphasize that the persona has only lightened his spirits briefly. This is followed by a short coda in which the accompaniment changes to gently pulsating chords, as the melody laments the futility of his dream.

“Im Herbste”

Zieh nur, du Sonne, zieh  O sun, be off with you
Eilend von hier, von hier!  Scurry away from here!
Auf daß Ihr Wärme komm’  So that she can be warmed
Einzig von mir.  By me alone!

Welkt nur, Blumen, welkt!  Wither you flowers, O wither!
Schweigt nur, ihr Vögelein!  Be silent you little birds!
Auf daß Ihr sing’ und blüh’  So that I alone may sing to her
Ich nur allein.  And bloom in doing so.

“Im Herbste” displays the composer’s ability to produce a song in miniature. While the piano plays a significant role in the above songs, in many ways the accompaniment here is more neutral to allow for a more flexible, arioso vocal line. This, in turn, plays a significant role into how the composer distributes the verse, as shown in example 1.3. The text consists of quatrains in trochaic tetrameter which Schumann sets in duple time (2/4). The treatment of the text melodically is intriguing, since Schumann spreads the stanzas over five-bar phrases, and still maintains the poetic meter. The additional bar results from the repetition of “einzig von mir” in mm. 4-5. This is similar to the concluding stanza, which repeats “nicht nur allein” in mm. 9-10. At first glance, the unevenness of the phrases appears to resist Schumann’s attempt to emphasize the importance of those lines: the persona wishes the sun away so that he alone may warm his beloved and flourish in so doing. However, the repetitions also arise from the melodic shape in the preceding measure – an ascending scale – that forms an incomplete phrase but is stabilized by a descending scale as shown in example 1.4.

---

20 Ibid., 255.
Lange harrt’ ich, aber endlich breiten
Auseinander sich des Fensters Flügel,
Und an seinem weißen Kreutze stehst du,
Berg und Thal ein stiller Friedensengel.

Vöglein ziehen nah’ an dir vorüber,
Täublein sitzen auf dem nahen Dache,
Kommt der Mond, und kommen alle Sterne,
Blicken all’ dir keck in’s blaue Auge.

Steh’ ich einsam, einsam in der Ferne,
Habe keine Flügel hinzufliegen,
Habe keine Strahlen hinzusenden,
Steh’ ich einsam, einsam in der Ferne!

I waited and waited, and finally
Your windows were flung open,
And there you stood against its white cross,
As a quiet angel of peace from hill and vale.

Little birds fly by near you
Little doves perch atop the nearby roof,
The moon comes and all the stars,
As I gaze boldly into your blue eyes.

Yet I stand lonely, far away,
I have no wings to fly to you,
I have no light to beam towards you,
As I stand lonely, far away!

21 Ibid., 254.
Gehst du, sprech’ ich mit verhaltenen
Thränen:
Ruhet süß, ihr lieben Augen!
Ruhet süß, ihr weißen, weißen Lilien
Ruhet süß, ihr lieben, lieben Hände!
Sprachen’s nach die Sterne an dem Himmel,
Sprachen’s nach die Blumen in dem Thale.
Weh! o weh! du hast es nicht vernommen!

As you go, I mutter, fighting back tears,
Rest sweetly, dear eyes!
Rest sweetly, white lilies!
Rest sweetly, dear hands!
In the heavens the stars speak these words,
The flowers from the valley repeat them
Alas! Alas! You do not hear them!

“An Anna II”

Nicht im Thale der süßen Heimat,
Beim Gemurmel der Silberquelle—
Bleich getragen aus dem Schlachtfeld,
Denk’ ich dein, du süßes Leben!
All’ die Freunde sind gefallen,
Sollt’ ich weilen hier der eine?
Nein! schon naht der bleiche Bote,
Der mich leitet zur süßen Heimat.

Not in the valley of my sweet homeland,
Or to the sounds of the silvery spring—
But pale, carried from the battlefield,
Do I think of you my sweet love!
All of my friends have fallen,
Am I the only one who remains?
No! The pale messenger will come soon,
To lead me to my sweet homeland.

While the three preceding songs are, for the most part, traditional in their formal compositional approach, “An Anna I and II” feature extended settings in which the “composer’s inspired fantasy animates practically every phrase.” There are no less than four tempo shifts in “An Anna I” (“Lange harrt’ ich”), which is set in a compound meter (12/8). For this reason, as Daverio indicates, Schumann received some slightly disparaging comments regarding his early Lieder from Gottlob Wiedebein, who diagnosed them as “the natural sins of youth . . . .” In Schumann’s defense, the composer must address several difficulties in Kerner’s verse. “An Anna I” features an immediate dilemma in its trochaic pentameter. In order to overcome the difficulties of setting the meter (where an additional

---

22 Ibid., 254.
23 Daverio, New Poetic Age, 32.
24 Ibid.
foot produces an odd-number of beats per line), Schumann implements several metrical shifts in the music throughout the five stanzas of the poem (he omits the first two of the original and begins with the third) and divides them into five distinct sections, thus producing a through-composed song.

The opening stanza, headed by the performance instruction “Schwärmerisch,” speaks of Andreas’s dream of Anna at home. Schumann maintains the enjambment between lines one and two of the third stanza in Kerner’s original. He then breaks the third line of the stanza into two parts and immediately connects the end of the initial line to the beginning of the second. While the beginning of the phrase preserves the meter of the line, the remainder proceeds like recitative, as shown in example 1.5. Schumann again divides the third line of the stanza, which leads to a repetition of “stehst du” over a rising sequence. The song’s opening assumes an unsettled character, and the composer establishes no true lyrical rise and fall as a result of the metric shifts, creating an improvisatory affect.

The second verse, marked Bewegter, again features a new metrical pattern by way of dotted rhythms. Only in this instance, the unsettled tension of the beginning yields to a dance-like melody, accompanied by steady, separated eighth notes in the piano. Schumann again divides each line in the stanza; however, in this spot, he preserves the poetic meter

Example 1.5: m. 3, “An Anna I”

25 The versification for this example follows its presentation in the first edition.
throughout. He continues the same accompanimental pattern for the third stanza (but in a minor mode) and retains the dance rhythm in the melody. While there is no change of tempo here, the change to the minor mode separates this stanza from the previous, as Andreas helplessly realizes the futility of his dream.

Schumann once again alters the tempo in the fourth verse (*Langsamer*) and in the fifth (*Solemne*), which are the most *cantabile* of the song. Yet even in these passages the composer avoids rigid metrical squareness. This is accomplished by setting the melody on an off-beat (see ex. 1.6). The fifth verse changes mood slightly by inserting an arioso and continues the trend of the fourth verse by avoiding even phrasing. The bars of arioso are interrupted by “Weh! O Weh!,” as Andreas comes to the realization that his efforts are useless.

Schumann omitted the final two stanzas of “An Anna II.” It could be that he excluded text due to the uneveness of the stanzas (the fourth contains four lines and fifth, five), but more likely, ending with the second strophe seemed a more fitting conclusion, for Andreas dies. The composer’s setting features several interesting melodic components. First, he encompasses the initial lines from the poem in a four-bar phrase and concludes it on a half-cadence. This would seem to require another phrase in order to create a resolution. However, the composer proceeds with a series of chromatic half-steps, leaving the initial phrase essentially unresolved. This sequence of half-steps is then used as the basis for a series of melodic leaps that continue in one way or another throughout the song (as in mm. 9-10).

Thus, until the original melody returns in m. 28, the vocal line is disjunct.

While the early Kerner settings show promise of what Schumann would become as a composer of *Lieder*, they also demonstrate his limited formal compositional training. This
might have been the reason why there is a cessation of *Lieder* composition after 1828. Schumann’s activities in the years immediately following 1828 would serve as an important time in his development as a composer as he was to receive his first formal compositional instruction, which resulted in some of his most important works for piano.

**Schumann’s “Year of Song” and Return to Kerner**

After a decade in the 1830s during which Schumann produced some of his most important piano compositions, the composer returned to setting songs in 1840. The result was one of his most productive compositional periods, his so-called *Liederjahr*. On 23 January Schumann set the first of 127 songs that year with the composition of “Du bist die eine Blume.”26 It was an important year for Schumann in more than just composition, moreover. In September of 1840 Schumann finally won the right to wed his beloved Clara after battling her father for some time. In many ways, Schumann’s *Liederjahr* was indicative of his relationship with Clara, for many of the songs he wrote deal with the subject of love in a variety of guises. One need to look no further than the some of the song cycles Schumann wrote during 1840 to see evidence of this (especially opp. 25, 37, and 42). The texts for these

---

cycles contain a wide variety of themes regarding aspects of love: love lost and found, love anticipated, marriage, and love set in ironic situations, to name a few. While some of these songs were autobiographical for Schumann, we might still wonder why he abandoned song composition for a period of roughly twelve years and why he abruptly change his focus to Lieder precisely in 1840.

It appears that although Schumann was keenly interested in combining his two favorite subjects in his teens, literature and music, his attitude changed somewhat in the following years. In a letter to the composer Hermann Hirschbach from 1839, Schumann asked, “Are you perhaps like me, who all my life have ranked song compositions beneath instrumental music, and never regarded it as a great art.”

Although the composer devoted his efforts to the keyboard in the 1830s, he did not find the sales of his piano compositions financially rewarding. Prior to his marriage to Clara, Schumann was required to make a minimum income (a stipulation cited in Wieck’s Deduktionsschrift, in which the composer had to earn a minimum of 1,500 thalers yearly). Since two thirds of that sum had to come from sales of compositions, we might suppose that he looked for something to earn more money immediately, which the publication of his songs offered.

At the same time, it would not be fair to say that Schumann’s return to vocal composition arose solely from financial necessities. Several letters from the composer in 1840 indicate that he was interested in composing an opera based on E. T. A. Hoffmann’s Doge und Dogaressa. In the period between his difficult court proceedings with Wieck and

---

27 Rufus Hallmark, The Genesis of Schumann’s Dichterliebe: A Source Study (Ann Arbor, 1976), 1. The Deduktionsschrift was Wieck’s condition for his daughter’s marriage. His consent was contingent upon Schumann’s agreement to a minimum yearly salary.

28 Daverio, New Poetic Age, 189.

29 Ibid., 1.
his marriage, Schumann wrote in February 1840, “through the result of a number of song compositions, I was able to forget everything else.”

Schumann’s prodigious output of songs culminated in some of the most significant works in his compositional oeuvre. They represent not only his ability to set a variety of poetic texts but also his interpretation of a wide range of subjects. To Schumann, the composer’s task lay in discovering the essence of a poem and translating it into music. This sentiment underlies the spirit of many Schumann songs from 1840, formed often into cycles. In February 1840, Schumann began setting his first cycle by Heine from the poet’s *Buch der Lieder* of 1827 for his *Liederkreis*, op. 24; although the nine songs comprising this cycle feature Romantic lyrics at their heart, pain and torment are addressed as well. For Daverio, op. 24 pursues a course “that allows us to follow the speaker’s progress from an initial state of mystification to an ultimate recognition of the ephemeral quality of love.” During this same time Schumann also worked on a group of four-part *Lieder* and envisaged what would become one of his longest cycles, *Myrthen*, op. 25. The texts for *Myrthen* were taken from verses by Rückert, Goethe, Mosen, Burns, Heine, and Byron, and appear as a “bouquet” of personal emotions dedicated “to his Beloved Bride.”

After putting the finishing touches on op. 25, Schumann set a number of individual songs that would become components of various collections that he published in subsequent years as opp. 49, 51, and 53. It was also during this time that he began two new cycles that would become the Eichendorff *Liederkreis* (op. 39) and *Dichterliebe* (op. 48). The composer identified op. 39 as “his most profoundly Romantic” work to date which depicts a

---

30 *TbII*, 96.


32 Daverio, *New Poetic Age* 213.
“succession of quickly changing moods and situations juxtaposed to create irony.”

This very sentiment also lies at the heart of Dichterliebe, in which Schumann acknowledges musically the often sardonic nature of Heine’s prose.

While many of Schumann’s songs during the early moments of his Liederjahr dealt with the ironies of love, his next attempts at lied composition took a different direction. With Frauenliebe und Leben, op. 42, Schumann portrayed a woman’s perspective as she falls in love, prepares to marry, has a child, and reflects upon her life after her husband dies. The subject of love is evident in further settings from the poet in Schumann’s Drei Gesänge op. 31, and op. 40, Fünf Lieder, composed in the same month. Sechs Gedichte aus dem Liederbuch eines Malers von Reinick assumes a different narrative trajectory featuring a sequence of events describing a persona’s idyllic life along the Rhine to his union with his beloved, and then returns to the reflections and memories of his world—a trajectory held in common with Schumann’s next cycle, the Kerner Liederreihe.

The Return to Kerner’s Poetry

Near the end of 1840, Schumann revisited Kerner’s verse during the months of November and December, during which he set fourteen texts by the poet. The main source for the songs was Kerner’s Die Dichtungen published in 1834. While several of the songs Schumann set are present in both the 1826 and 1834 editions of Kerner’s poetry, the latter was almost certainly the source for the composer in 1840, since three of the texts selected (“Stirb, Lieb’ und Freud’!,” “Erstes Grün,” and “Alte Laute”) do not appear in the earlier edition. Clara probably used the 1834 edition for the entries in the Abschriften von Gedichten zur


34 Schanze and Schulte, Literarische Vorlager, 239.
Komposition, a manuscript that represents an initial stage for many of Schumann’s songs (from 1839 through 1850). Here both he and Clara copied out poetic texts for prospective setting. Justinus Kerner appears among the first authors entered in the Gedichtabschriften, and all of his poems appear in Clara’s hand. Of the seventeen Kerner poems she copied into the Gedichtabschriften, Robert set only five, however. And of these only three occupied his attention in 1840: “Stirb, Lieb’ und Freud’!,” “Sängers Trost,” and “Wanderung.” Therefore, we may assume, without any other evidence to the contrary, that the ultimate source for the texts of the Kerner Lieder was the poet’s Dichtungen.

As we turn our attention toward the fourteen texts Schumann set by Kerner, it will be appropriate for the remainder of this chapter to outline the three distinct phases through November and December 1840 during which the composer selected Kerner’s poetry, and then to see how he set them initially to music. In examining the various selections by Kerner, I will assess the poems as Schumann encountered them in their original source, and evaluate the poetry in each phase for its scansion and structure, in addition to its content and conceits. After these initial considerations, I will then turn to how Schumann declaimed Kerner’s verse by reconstructing his lost melodic sketches from the first layer of the voice part in his full autograph in the extant Liederbuch (LbIII). From this, we can begin to envisage what kind of collection Schumann might have had in mind during each successive compositional phase of setting Kerner’s verse. These explorations in turn will prepare us to examine Schumann’s compositional process in later chapters as well as to assess his conception of op. 35 as he finally published it.


36 This process represents a conjectural exercise since the original sketches are lost. See Chapter 2 below for an extensive discussion of the composer’s compositional process for his 1840 Lieder.
Setting Kerner, Phase I

We find the first mention that Schumann had begun composing the Kerner Lieder on 22 November 1840, when Clara noted in their joint diary that, “Robert has again composed three magnificent songs. The texts include Justinus Kerner, ‘Lust der Sturmnacht,’ ‘Stirb, Lieb’ und Freud’!” and ‘Trost im Gesang’.” From dates indicated by the composer in his household accounts (TbIII) and in the Berlin autograph, the composition of the initial Kerner songs began on 20 November 1840 with “Lust der Sturmnacht.” During that month, Schumann set six more songs from Kerner’s Dichtungen. The chart below records this first compositional phase, noting the order of the songs composed, the source(s) of their date, and the pages in Kerner’s Dichtungen on which the poems appear. I have also included the pages from the Gedichtabschriften (where applicable) that Schumann might have also consulted (see Table 1.1).

Table 1.1: Selection of Texts, Phase I for Schumann’s 1840 Kerner Lieder

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Song Title</th>
<th>Date Comp.</th>
<th>Date Source</th>
<th>Dichtungen</th>
<th>Gedichtabschriften</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Lust der Sturmnacht”</td>
<td>20.11.40</td>
<td>TbIII38 and Lb III</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Trost im Gesang”</td>
<td>21.11.40</td>
<td>TbIII</td>
<td>127</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20.11.40</td>
<td>LbIII</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Stirb, Lieb’ und Freud’!”</td>
<td>22.11.40</td>
<td>TbIII and LbIII</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Wanderung”</td>
<td>23.11.40</td>
<td>TbIII and LbIII</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Auf das Trinkglas eines verstorbenen Freundes”</td>
<td>24.11.40</td>
<td>TbIII</td>
<td>193</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25.11.40</td>
<td>LbIII</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Stille Liebe”</td>
<td>24.11.40</td>
<td>TbIII and LbIII</td>
<td>198</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Frage”</td>
<td>11.40</td>
<td>LbIII</td>
<td>221</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

37 TbII, 126.

38 All dates in this table from TbIII, 167.
The texts given below appear as Schumann originally encountered them in Kerner’s

*Dichtungen* of 1834.  

“Lust der Sturmnacht”

Wann durch Berg’ und Thale draußen
Regen schauert Stürme brausen,
Schild und Fenster hell erklirren,
Und in Nacht die Wandrer irren,

Ruht es sich so süß hier innen,
Aufgelöst in sel’ges Minnen;
All der goldne Himmelsschimmer,
Flieht herein in’s stille Zimmer.

Reiches Leben! hab' Erbarmen!
Halt mich fest in linden Armen!
Lenzesblumen aufwärts dringen,
Wölklein ziehen, Vögel singen.

Ende nie, du Sturmnacht wilde!
Klirrt, ihr Fenster! Schwankt, ihr Schilde!
Bäumt euch, Wälder! braus’, o Welle!
Mich umfängt des Himmels Helle.

When outside through mountain and valley
Rain pours and storms rage,
Signs and windows rattle,
And in the night travelers wander,

It is so sweet to rest inside,
Lost in blessed wooing,
All the golden light of the heavens,
Escapes into this quiet room.

Precious life have mercy!
Wrap me in your gentle arms!
Spring flowers press upwards,
Little clouds pass by, birds sing.

Never end, you wild stormy night!
Rattle ye windows! Swing ye signs!
Shake ye trees, and roar o waves!
Heaven’s light envelops me.

Kerner’s “Lust der Sturmnacht” is written in an almost perfectly regular trochaic tetrameter and features quatrains of rhymed couplets. All of the end rhymes are pure in this highly regular text with consistent rhyme scheme throughout, and enjambment is surprisingly rare in this poem, which is highly paratactic (short isolated statements). There is only one example of alliteration in the second strophe in “sich,” “so,” and “süß.”

The verse features several poetic tropes that give it meaning on various levels. First, we are drawn to the fact that an individual has described a violent storm outside using sonic descriptions of the signs and windows rattling. Therefore, we might think of the opening as

---

39 The following texts are all taken from their original version from Kerner’s *Die Dichtungen. Neue vollständige Sammlung in einem Bande* (Stuttgart, 1834).

40 Ibid., *Dichtungen*, 42.
invoking an acoustic setting. The persona alludes to the traveler’s wandering amid this
deluge, and it is comforting for him to shelter not only inside, but in the delights of love. The
first contrast lies between what the persona observes outside and what he feels inside. The
speaker further contrasts the violent storm to his comfortable room in terms of the sky: just as
it has produced a fierce storm, so have its heavens shone golden light. The next strophe
moves from the storm when the persona alludes to the blooming of spring flowers and the
clouds parting to the singing of bird songs. Here nature not only provides contrast, but also a
sense of the persona’s world at odds with his outside surroundings. Spring is, in a sense,
symbolic of this quiet room. Thus, in the bliss he encounters in these confines, he wishes the
storm never to end, since heaven’s light has enveloped him.

While the imagery of the poem proceeds through contrasting juxtaposition, its exact
meaning is another matter. The persona has certainly established his space through his
descriptions of what is going on both inside and outside. But what is the perspective of his
beloved? He makes her the object of his vision, and his own relief results from amorous
delights. The imagery of the poem depicts what the persona is presently witnessing and
hearing. But is the beloved actually present or is she merely a vision? The persona details
specific effects of her love and what it means to him; however, a sense of mystery remains
about her physical proximity.

The poetic conceit for “Lust der Sturmnacht” is typically Romantic. We become
privy to the persona’s notion that all is well despite the storm. This is tied directly to a
dramatic imagery from which we gain a sense of his exhilaration at being protected by love.
In addition, the idea of his resulting inner peace is signified by a supernatural element:
heaven’s light. Not only has his love (or perhaps his memory of it) secured his present
situation, but also it constitutes his hope for the future, since he wishes the storm to continue
in order for his present state to continue to exist.

Schumann’s treatment of “Lust der Sturmnacht” seems to fit Kerner’s poem in
preserving its syntactical units and rhetorical meaning. The composer frames the four stanzas
from the poem by composing the first and last strophes, which describe the persona’s
reaction to the violent storm, in an expressive style, as shown in example 1.7. The inner
stanzas begin in a more delicate manner; however, whereby the voice descends and then
ascends more gently in its melody (see ex. 1.8).⁴¹

One of the musical aspects of Schumann’s setting comes in the way he treats the
evernalultimate foot for each line from the poem. In each case, the composer uses some variation
of a melisma in setting the specific word. The end result forces each of the lines together. For
the first stanza, this comes in the form of an ascending leap on a two-note melisma (as noted
in ex. 1.7 with the words “Thale” and “Stürme”). In the second stanza, the penultimate foot for
the first two lines is set identically, ascending by chromatic half-step as shown in example

⁴¹ In the following analysis of the melodies I use the first layer of realization in the Berlin autograph as the basis
for my discussion because this comes closest to determining what the composer initially had in mind when
setting Kerner’s verse to music in the absence of extant melodic sketches. A full explanation of Schumann’s
compositional process for songs follows in the next chapter, where I discuss the state of the songs in the piano
drafts, the only known version we have other than the first edition.
1.8 on “süß.” Schumann changes this approach somewhat for the final lines of the second strophe by adding an embellishment as shown in example 1.9. This culminates in the setting for the final stanza, where trills are used for the penultimate word as we find in example 1.10. While this might seem as though it is merely a gesture of melodic shaping by the composer, the very words Schumann emphasizes through each trill or melisma highlight the main points of dramatic imagery with which Kerner confronts us with in his poem.

Example 1.9: mm. 16-19, “Lust der Sturmnacht”

Example 1.10: mm. 37-39, “Lust der Sturmnacht”

“Trost im Gesang”

Der Wandrer, dem verschwunden
So Sonn’ als Mondenlicht,
Der singt ein Lied in’s Dunkel
Und härmt sich länger nicht.

Er schreitet muthig weiter
Die menchenleere Bahn,
Viel lichte Sangesbilder
Die ziehen ihm voran.

Nacht ist’s auch mir geworden,
Die Freunde stehen fern,
Von meinem Himmel schwindet
Der allerletze Stern;

Doch geh’ ich muthig weiter
Die menschenleere Bahn,

The wanderer who is bereft
Of both sun and moonlight,
Sings a song in the darkness,
And no longer is afraid.

He sets forth bravely
On a deserted road,
Many bright songs
Urge him forward.

Night has also fallen about me
My friends stand far away,
From my sky has vanished
The very last star.

Still I set forth bravely
On a deserted road,

42 Ibid., 127.
Noch ziehen Sangesbilder
Ja mir auch licht voran.

While many bright songs
Still urge me forward.

“Trost im Gesang” presents another example of Kerner’s *Langzeilenvers*. Each of the strophes feature enjambment: in the first and second stanzas we find it between the first two lines, and in the third, between the final two lines. In the final strophe both couplets are completely enjambed. Finally, this selection features no alliteration whatsoever (a trait quite typical of Kerner’s poetry).

Kerner’s text reveals a traveler speaking from two points of view. The first finds him generalizing about a traveler in the third person (in the first two stanzas), and the final two shift to him talking about his own experiences in the first person. Kerner uses a musical reference in the first strophe to signify that the wanderer, bereft of light, has found illuminations in song. The imagery from the poem in this stanza alludes to the present course of a traveler who no longer grieves. The next strophe expands the idea that bright songs keep him going along a deserted road. The narrator in the third person who witnesses the now “brave” wanderer is also alone. The perspective then changes to the first person as the narrator explains that night has fallen upon his world through a symbolic gesture: his friends are far away, and from his sky every last star has vanished. Still, he sets forth confidently into his uncertain future with many bright songs to keep him going.

Several poetic conceits carry weight in this poem. First, we become aware of what it means to be a wayfarer. The narrator witnesses how a wanderer, because of his travels, no longer grieves. Once the narrator speaks in first person, he notes that he is removed from his surroundings. The power of song for both contains significance as well. It is, in its way, a harbinger of hope that they might continue, in spite of his current environment. Song also signifies the end of grieving in that one must find one’s voice in order to continue effectively.
Kerner uses juxtaposed imagery here to create meaning. He contrasts the nocturnal world of the traveler to his bright songs, then reiterates this for from the wayfaring point of view as well.

We might think of the poetic conceit as individual reflection. In a sense the traveler becomes the narrator when he attests to his manner of overcoming his grief. The course for the speaker requires him to find his song, which could be viewed as a metaphor for finding himself. This correlates to his own individual path from which music directs or lights the way. The fact that one must become a singer to continue is a powerful notion. We might ask of the travelers, however, what the nature of their song is.

The setting of “Trost im Gesang” is a march, with a declamatory vocal part in which Schumann immediately displays the Langzeilenvers by adopting a fairly straightforward correspondence between the common-time time signature and the tetrameter and by dealing with the first of the two accented syllables over a half note at the end of the first line as noted in example 1.11. Although the tetrameter is maintained for much of the setting,—

Der Wándrer dém Verschwún-dén,
So Sónn’ als Móndenlicht. ['']

—we find a point at which Schumann ignores Kerner’s iambic pattern at the beginning of the third stanza. Instead of beginning on a pickup as he did in previous stanzas, the composer begins on the downbeat of the measure for “Nacht” as noted in example 1.12, and he also ignores the second accented syllable of the initial line by playing it on a weak beat in its measure.

One of unique aspects of the setting concerns how Schumann treats enjambment, which often occurs between lines of couplets in each quatrain. The approach for this is varied from stanza to stanza: we find that the composer effaces the enjambment between the first
two lines of the initial strophe, as shown in the final measure of example 1.11. Schumann, however, preserves the enjambments in the second and fourth stanzas but uses a different approach for the third where he separates each of the lines with quarter rests (see ex. 1.12).

Example 1.11: mm. 1-3, “Trost im Gesang”

Example 1.12: mm. 23-24, “Trost im Gesang”

“Stirb, Lieb’ und Freud’!” 43

Zu Augsburg steht ein hohes Haus, In Augsburg stands a tall house,
Nahbei dem alten Dom, Near the old Cathedral,
Da tritt an hellem Morgen aus From it one bright morning
Ein Mägdelein gar fromm; Steps a pious maid;
Gesang erschallt; Singing rings out;
Zum Dome wallt And the dear girl
Die liebe Gestalt. Wanders to the Cathedral.

Dort vor Mariä heilig Bild There before Mary’s holy image
Sie betend niederkniert, She kneels in prayer,
Der Himmel hat ihr Herz erfüllt Heaven has filled her heart
Und alle Weltlust flieth: And all worldly desires leave her:
“O Jungfrau rein! “O pure virgin!
Laß mich allein Let me be yours
Dein eigen seyn!” And yours alone!”

Alsbald der Glocke dumpfer Klang And soon the muffled ringing of the bells
Die Betenden erweckt. Awake the worshippers from prayer.
Das Mägdlein wallt die Hall’ entlang, The maiden wanders down the aisle,
Es weiß nicht was es trägt; And knows not what she wears;
Am Haupte, ganz Around her head,
Von Himmelsglanz, In heaven’s light,
Einen Liljenkranz. A crown of lilies.
Mit Stauen sehen all die Leut’ With wonder all the people stare
Dies Kränzlein licht im Haar, At the bright crown in her hair,

43 Ibid., 43.
Das Mägdlein aber wallt nicht weit,  
The young girl does not wander far,  
Tritt vor den Hochaltar:  
She steps in before the high altar:  
“As a nun consecrate me  
“Zur Nonne weiht  
A poor handmaid!  
“Mich arme Maid!  
Farewell, love and joy!”  
“Stirb, Lieb’ und Freud!”  

Gott, gieb, daß dieses Mägdelein  
God, grant that this maiden  
Ihr Kränzlein friedlich trag’!  
Wear her crown in peace  
Es ist die Allerliebste mein,  
She is my most beloved  
Bleibt’s bis zum jüngsten Tag.  
And will be to judgement day.  
Sie weiß es nicht.–  
She knows not–  
Mein Herz zerbricht–  
That my heart is breaking–  
Stirb, Lieb’ und Licht!  
Farewell love and light!

Kerner’s text presents an interesting nuance with regard to construction of strophes: he casts all five strophes unconventionally as septains. The first four lines of each present cross-rhymed quatrains in iambic tetrameter followed by three lines in end-rhymed dimeter. The end rhymes are all pure, with the exception of the fourth strophe where “Leut” and “weit” and “weiht,” “Maid,” and “Freud” are impure. There are examples of alliteration found throughout as well: in the first strophe, “hohes” and “Haus”; in the second, “Himmel” and “hat”; and in the fifth with “Gott” and “gieb” and “daß” and “dieses.”

Kerner focuses special attention on the sections of dimeter. In the first, singing signifies the start of the maiden’s voyage to the cathedral. In the next stanza the maiden finds her voice for the first time, as she asks an image of the Virgin Mary to accept her vocation. In the third strophe, Kerner uses two symbolic references, the first to light that bears significance for the poem’s conclusion as it compares light and death, and the second to lilies, the flower of purity and also of death or rebirth. The two combine in this instance to show heaven’s illumination upon her. She speaks again in the next strophe to request consecration.
The final stanza reveals the poetic twist for “Stirb, Lieb’ und Freud’!” as a ballad in which the third-person narrator becomes the persona. While he tells of the circumstances surrounding the pious maiden, who seemingly gives up her life to take the veil, in the end it is the narrator himself who bids farewell to love and light, since he has lost his beloved. While the horizon of events in the first four strophes leads us to believe that the nun is the one who sacrifices, our expectations are reversed when the narrator reveals his disappointed love. The consequence is two-fold: his heart is broken, though she does not know it, and his “light” is now extinguished. In retrospect we may have sensed earlier that all is not well for the persona, when he describes muffled bells, which might indicate a funeral. This reference becomes symbolic of his own loss, now that she is gone.

This sudden change of perspective illustrates an example of *apostrophe*, which according to Rufus Hallmark, “is the rhetorical figure of shifting away from narrative or description to address someone or something other than the general auditor or reader.”

According to Hallmark, the use of *apostrophe* is two-fold: not only does it change the address of the poem, but it also alters our perception of the persona of the speaker. In this instance, the narrator becomes the persona and abruptly shifts his focus by directly addressing God, asking him to grant his beloved her consecration in peace. This sudden turn thus provides a moment of self-discovery for persona (and the reader as well), in which the persona reveals that the personal loss is his rather than the pious maid’s. As we shall see in other selections of Kerner’s verse, the use of *apostrophe* is also central to their conceit.

---

44 Rufus Hallmark, “The Literary and Musical Rhetoric of Apostrophe in *Winterreise*.” Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Musicological Society, Quebec City, November 2, 2007. My thanks go to Professor Hallmark for generously providing me with a copy of this paper.
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One of the difficulties in setting Kerner’s text comes in the way he casts each of the stanzas, in particular, the final three lines of each strophe. Thus, the issue becomes how the composer handles setting the septains, and specifically, the various ways Schumann sets the final three lines of each strophe. In essence, Schumann divides each stanza in two parts: an eight-measure setting for the first four lines followed four measures for the final three lines. For the first strophe, the melodic material runs in parallel phrases for the first four lines (see ex. 1.13). The final three lines of each strophe receive a different melody. The tercet in the first stanza relates relatively closely to the preceding quatrain (see ex. 1.14). We also find that the composer begins by using a melody that is similar rhythmically to the preceding musical phrases. He then proceeds by connecting all three lines of dimeter (repeating the last line twice) and by compressing them into a four-bar phrase. It appears, therefore, as though the three lines are really two, with the first in iambic tetrameter and the second ending in a silent foot.

The second stanza displays a different approach not only to setting its final three lines are set but also to its initial line. Here, Schumann immediately ignores Kerner’s iambic pattern by beginning with “Dort” on a downbeat rather than a pickup, as shown in example 1.15. The only other portion of the setting that ignores the iambic pattern occurs in the fourth line.

Example 1.13: mm. 1-5, “Stirb, Lieb’ und Freud’!”
Example 1.14: mm. 10-14, “Stirb, Lieb’ und Freud’!”

line of the final stanza where the composer produced a similar phrase to the one above by placing an accent on the first word of the line rather than the second (see ex. 1.16). As for the final three lines of the second stanza, Schumann establishes a pattern for the tercets in the remaining stanzas. Instead of connecting them as he did for the initial stanza he treats each line paratactically, one with three descending four-note musical patterns, and the first and third lines set to the same melody (see ex. 1.17). Thus, the tercets from the final three stanzas are given greater significance, as the maid speaks and the persona reveals the twist in the story at the poem’s conclusion.

Example 1.15: mm. 15-16, “Stirb, Lieb’ und Freud’!”

Example 1.16: mm. 65-66, “Stirb, Lieb’ und Freud’!”

Example 1.17: mm. 22-27, “Stirb, Lieb’ und Freud’!”
Wohlauf und froh gewandert
In’s unbekannte Land!
Zerrissen, ach! zerrissen
Ist manches theure Band.

Ihr heimatlichen Kreuze,
Wo ich oft betend lag,
Ihr Bäume, ach! ihr Hügel,
O blickt mir segnend nach!

Noch schlält die weite Erde,
Kein Vogel weckt den Hain,
Doch bin ich nicht verlassen,
Doch bin ich nicht allein:

Denn, ach! auf meinem Herzen
Trag ich ihr theures Pfand,
Ich fühls’s und Erd’ und Himmel
Sind innig mir verwandt.

Let us set off on the road
To an unknown land!
Many close bonds
Have already been torn apart.

Ye crosses of my homeland,
Where I often prayed,
You trees, O! You hills,
Grant me your blessing as I go!

The wide earth still sleeps,
No bird wakes the grove,
Yet I am not foresaken,
Nor am I alone:

On my heart I carry
Her dear token of love,
I feel it and earth and heaven
Are one with me.

“Wanderung” provides another example of Kerener’s Langzeilenvers. The couplets of stanza one feature enjambment, as do both couplets in the last stanza. There are two examples of internal rhymes, both of which are found in the third strophe and feature the same words in “ich” and “nicht.”

We find a number of poetic tropes similar to those in “Trost im Gesang.” First, the persona leaves the idyllic homeland as a result of broken bonds of affection. He then reflects on his present surroundings and on feelings from his past. He finds comfort in his beloved’s pledge, which sustain him when his surroundings sleep. This in turn points him toward his future course.

While a sense of loss is central to the wayfarer’s plight, nostalgia provides a more specific poetic conceit. In this sense, “Wanderung” presents this conceit like “Stirb, Lieb’ und Freud’!,” where the persona is separated from his beloved. His memory of her in

---

46 Ibid., 137.
“Wanderung” forces him to reflect upon his course, however. The persona does this through
the use of *apostrophe*: he bids farewell to the crosses to which he prayed, asks the trees and
hills for their blessing, and knows that he is not alone. By the end of the poem the persona
has reached different surroundings. Yet he still feels united to his beloved by means of
memory.

The setting of “Wanderung” seems to exemplify the very subject matter of the poetry
in traveling, with the vocal part frolicking throughout most of the setting, though moving to a
more declamatory style in the end, where the persona announces that his purpose for
traveling is the result of lost love. Just as with “Trost im Gesang,” we find instances where
Schumann places syntax above poetic form. This is most evident in the way that the
composer runs the end and beginning of lines into one another throughout the setting. We
find this especially in the ways the composer treats enjambment. As we see in the initial
stanza, Schumann does not separate the two lines of text (see ex. 1.18). This same procedure
also holds true for the other enjambed couplet in the first strophe as well as final one in the
last stanza. The same cannot be said, however, for the first couplet of the last stanza where
Schumann clearly separates both lines with an eighth rest. This decision leads the composer
to change the pattern of the *Langzeilenvers*, since the second line is declaimed over a series
of ascending eighth notes (see ex. 1.19).47

---

47 I discuss in detail some of the factors that might have led the composer to make such a decision in the next
chapter on compositional process.
“Auf das Trinkglas eines verstorbenen Freundes” ⁴⁸

Du herrlich Glas, nun stehst du leer,
Glas, das er oft mit Lust gehoben;
Die Spinne hat rings um dich her,
Indéß den düstern Flor geworben.

Jetzt sollst du mir gefülltet seyn
Mondhell mit Gold der deutschen Reben!
In deiner Tiefe heil’gen Schein
Schau’ ich hinab mit frommem Beben.

Was ich erschau’ in deinem Grund,
Ist nicht Gewöhnlichen zu nennen,
Doch wird mir klar zu dieser Stund’,
Wie nichts den Freund vom Freund kann
trennen.

Auf diesen Glauben, Glas so hold!
Trink’ ich dich aus mit hohem Muthe.
Klar spiegelt sich der Sterne Gold,
Pokal, in deinem theuren Blute.

Still geht de Mond das Thal entlang,
Ernst tönt die mitternächt’ge Stunde,
Leer steht das Glas, der heil’ge Klang
Tönt nach in dem krystall’nen Grunde.

“Auf das Trinkglas eines verstorbenen Freundes” is written in a regular iambic tetrameter,
usually with pure cross rhymes. There are several examples of alliteration: in the first strophe
with “den” and “düstern”; in the second with “Mondhell” and “mit”; in the fourth with
“Glauben” and “Glas.” There are also several examples of enjambment: between each

⁴⁸ Ibid., 193.
couplet in the second and third strophe, the first two lines of the fourth, and in the final lines of the last strophe.

A sense of nostalgia again forms the poetic conceit for this example. First, the speaker recalls a friend’s memory through a simple object. The cup symbolizes this reminiscence: just as it was an object of pleasure, its emptiness signifies the persona’s own perception of loss as well. Once that cup is filled, however, so too is his spirit. It evokes further meaning for the persona, because he is allowed to reunite, in a way, to his friend’s memory.

The use of apostrophe is especially evident in “Auf das Trinkglas eines verstorbenen Freundes” where the persona addresses the cup using religious symbolism as a means of portraying mysticism. Kerner associates the cup with the last supper in the fourth stanza, when the persona describes the precious blood of the chalice that reflects the stars from above. While nostalgia is used to indicate remembrance, it also provides a supernatural element for the persona. Not only is the memory of the departed symbolized within the cup’s depths, but also a sense that his very being is tied to its contents. Although the persona reflects on the cup in the beginning, it transports to an extraordinary realm. And though the midnight hour has rung and the glass is empty, he is still aware of the holy sounds from within. Here again, Kerner’s text depicts the passage of the persona into a new space: through the power of nostalgic contemplation, he moves into a supernatural world.

Schumann’s setting of “Auf das Trinkglas eines verstorbenen Freundes” offers a blend of two contrasting styles for the voice, which we find in its initial phrases, where both lyrical and declamatory melodic shapes are applied. It also stands as one of the most harmonically and structurally complex songs among the Kerner settings. Although the composer establishes E flat major as the main key area at the start, the song moves through F
minor, D flat major, G flat major, and C flat minor as well. Schumann begins by following the meter of Kerner’s text at the outset of the first stanza (see ex. 1.20).

Example 1.20: mm. 1-4, “Auf das Trinkglas eines verstorbenen Freundes”

However, he quickly strays from the poet’s iambic pattern for the second line of the initial stanza (in measure three) by setting the first syllable on a strong beat for “Glas.” While the remainder of the composer’s setting stanza through the fourth strophe honors Kerner’s meter, we find an entirely different situation for the fifth strophe, where Schumann changes the iambic pattern for the first three and one half lines: the initial word of each line begins on the downbeat of its respective measure (see ex. 1.21). Schumann follows the same procedure for the third line of the last strophe and concludes by honoring the iambic pattern at “der heil’ge” and by connecting the beginning of final line on “tönt” to the end of the penultimate line (see ex. 1.22). Even though Schumann honors the iambic pattern for the final line, he distributes it over five bars.

Finally, Schumann treats one of the two examples of enjambment in “Trinkglas” as he did in the previous song. For the enjambment found in the first two lines of the second stanza, we find that the composer again places syntax above poetic form by connecting both

Example 1.21: mm. 37-43, “Auf das Trinkglas eines verstorbenen Freundes”
lines of text as noted in example 1.23. He follows a similar procedure with the next couplet in the stanza by both lines in a similar fashion. This procedure changes somewhat for the example found in the final two lines of the last strophe where a fermata effectively separates both lines (see ex. 1.22 above). Schumann also preserves the enjambment found in the initial couplet of the fourth stanza by dividing the both lines evenly over a four-bar phrase (see ex. 1.24).

Könnt’ ich dich in Liedern preisen,  
Säng’ ich dir das längste Lied,  
Ja, ich würd’ in allen Weisen  
Dich zu singen, nimmer müd.

Doch was immer mich betrübe,  
Ist, daß ich nur immer stumm,  
Tragen kann dich, Herzgeliebte!  
In des Busens Heiligthum.

If I could praise you in songs,  
I would sing to you the longest song,  
Yes, I would never tire  
Of praising you, in every song.

But I am always saddened,  
That I can carry you only,  
My love, in silence!  
In the sanctuary of my heart.

---

49 This illustration is the best representation of Schumann’s initial layer. As we will see in the next chapter, this version was heavily revised in the autograph.

50 Ibid., 198.
And this I say aloud,
Or proclaim in the joy of song,
That you might think I carry something more profound
Than you, heart, in my warm bosom.

This torment has forced me,
To sing this little song,
A song of the bitter pain,
Of not being able to sing for you.

Although “Stille Liebe” is one of Kerner’s perfectly regular texts metrically (trochaic tetrameter), it features instances of pure and impure rhymes, “Lied” and “müd” in the first stanza and “betrübe” and “Herzigliebte” in the second. In addition, there is use of alliteration in the third strophe with “daß” and “du.” Two couplets are enjambed as well, in the final two lines of the first and third strophes and the couplets of the second stanza are both enjambed.

One of the confusing elements in this text comes in the interpretation of the third strophe. While the surrounding stanzas contain an apologia from a persona who reveals his songless torment, the third does not translate as easily. It indicates the persona’s angst at his inadequacy or suggests that his beloved might think he harbors something more profound than thoughts of her. This connects to the previous strophe, where the persona sings that his beloved remains in the silent depths of his heart.

We can read the whole of Kerner’s text as layer upon layer of contradiction from a persona attempting to sing. Alas, his attempts at a “song of praise” are only conditional. The first stanza presents his initial impulse: were he to sing, it would be incessant song. But in the second stanza the persona faces reality: he cannot sing, therefore silence provides consolation. The final contradiction presents the ironic conceit for “Stille Liebe.” Since he cannot sing of his beloved, he must fashion a song about not singing.
The vocal part for “Stille Liebe” operates in a somewhat narrower range than in previous songs, as noted in example 1.25 which, by and large, acts as a series of repeated notes that descend step-wise. We also find that Schumann effaces the enjambment found between the third and fourth lines by connecting the two at m. 7 (see ex. 1.25). The composer follows this same procedure by connecting all of the lines in the second strophe, which is completely enjambed.

Schumann made one of his biggest alterations to Kerner’s verse in “Stille Liebe” by omitting the third strophe completely. He may have chosen not to include it because its meaning is unclear. Schumann may also have wished to arrive at the point of the verse in the final strophe, which reveals the persona’s angst about not singing. Thus the connection of his silence in the second stanza to his torment in the final strophe becomes clearer.

“Frage”

Wärst du nicht, heil’ger Abendschein!  
Wärst du nicht, sternerhellte Nacht!  
Du Blüthenschmuck! du üpp’ger Hain!  
Und du Gebirg voll ernster Pracht!  
Du, Vogelsang aus Himmeln hoch!  
Du, Lied aus voller Menschenbrust!  
Wärst du nicht—ach! was füllte noch  
In arger Zeit ein Herz mit Lust?—

If you did not exist, holy light of evening!  
If you did not exist, star-bright night!  
You beautiful flowers! You overflowing grove!  
And you, mountains in your solemn glory!  
You birdsong from heaven high!  
You song flowing from the full human heart!  
If you did not exist, oh! What joy  
Would fill a heart in times of sorrow?

“Frage,” written in iambic tetrameter, presents an interesting structure. First, the poem consists of a single octave. It features cross-rhyme, and its content appears in couplets by
which Kerner presents conditional situations about a persona who compares one aspect of his
surroundings to another. This is accomplished through anaphora: the persona exclaims
“Wärst du nicht” three separate times, and the ensuing list of objects also constitutes
immediate repetition, since all begin with “du.” While Kerner pairs the persona’s
descriptions from line to line, each signifies a disparate element: the skies and the earth in
lines one through four, and these items contrast to the power of song in lines five and six.

“Frage” presents conditional statements comparable to “Stille Liebe.” But in this
instance the persona, through the use of *apostrophe*, speaks directly to a number of items in
nature: were it not for their existence, there would be nothing to heal the heart in times of
sorrow. His conditional exclamations attempt to find consolation in his current situation.
Once again, Kerner’s text uses nature and the power of song as a cliché to establish human
consolation. For the persona, the significance of the birdsong ties nature to that which is
human. As in “Trost im Gesang” and “Wanderung,” “Frage” portrays reactions to
surroundings that give life meaning.

Schumann’s setting of “Frage” reflects the small-scale design of the poem (it consists
of sixteen measures, continous from start to finish), and the composer’s setting follows the
iambic tetrameter of the text from the outset. The melodic content resembles that of “Stille
Liebe” particularly in the contour of the opening phrase, where the voice begins on G and
proceeds by step down to E-flat as we see in example 1.26. We find only minimal variance
from the poetic meter in the last half of the final line of the poem where the composer
chooses a syllabic approach (four consecutive sixteenth notes) before concluding as he does
in example 1.27.
Schumann apparently intended these first seven Kerner settings as a cycle. In an entry in the couple’s joint diary during the week of November 22 to 29 1840, he wrote significantly, “Ein kleiner Cyklus Kerner’scher Gedichte ist fertig.” Although he envisaged these texts as a coherent entity, the selections in this first phase do not create a narrative trajectory. Nonetheless, several consistent poetic themes in these poems provide some insight into what Schumann initially had in mind when he selected Kerner’s texts: they deal with lost love, travelling, death, separation from homeland, grief, and the power of song. Schumann reconsidered his initial selection almost immediately, however, and continued to set more texts by Kerner.

Phase II

Schumann returned to setting verse from Kerner during the early weeks of December 1840. In all, he selected the four poems listed in Table 1.2, proceeding along some of the same lines that had motivated his earlier selections. Many of the poetic topoi of these texts would reflect several of the subjects we have noted previously.

---

51 *ThII*, 127. We will return to questions of how Schumann would eventually shape the cycle in Chapter three.
Table 1.2: Selection of Texts, Phase II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Song Title</th>
<th>Date Com.</th>
<th>Date Source</th>
<th>Dichtungen</th>
<th>Gedichtabschriften</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Erstes Grün”</td>
<td>7.12.40</td>
<td>LbIII</td>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Stille Thränen”</td>
<td>7.12.40</td>
<td>TbIII and LbIII</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Wer machte dich so krank?”</td>
<td>11.12.40</td>
<td>TbIII and LbIII</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Alte Laute”</td>
<td>[11.12.40]</td>
<td>LbIII</td>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“Erstes Grün” 53

Du junges Grün, du frisches Gras!
Wie manches Herz durch dich genas,
Das von des Winters Schnee erkrankt,
O wie mein Herz nach dir verlangt!
Schon brichst du aus der Erde Nacht,
Wie dir mein Aug’ entgegen lacht!
Hier in des Waldes stillem Grund
Drück’ ich dich, Grün, an Herz und Mund.

Wie treibt’s mich von den Menschen fort!
Mein Leid das hebt kein Menschenwort;
Nur junges Grün, an’s Herz gelegt,
Macht, daß mein Herze stiller schlägt.

You young green, you fresh grass!
How you have healed many a heart,
Made sick by the Winter’s snow;
Oh how my heart longs for you!
Already erupting from the earth’s night,
How my eyes smile on you!
Here in the quiet forest glen
I press you, greens, to my heart and lips.

How I am driven away from humankind!
No human word can ease my pain;
Only fresh greens, laid to my heart,
Make my heart beat more quietly.

“Erstes Grün” (originally titled “Frühlingskur” by Kerner), written in iambic tetrameter, is highly regular in its metrical pattern. Additionally, the end rhymes are both paired and perfect. Kerner uses alliteration only once in the opening strophe with “durch” and “dich.” A few examples of enjambment appear in the second and third strophes between the third and fourth lines. One of the more interesting aspects of the text comes in the way that Kerner uses active verbs to personify nature. In the first strophe, the fresh shoots heal wounded hearts

52 Although Schumann did not provide a date for this song in Lb II or TbIII, the music for “Wer machte dich so krank?” and “Alte Laute” are the same. Therefore Schumann likely set this song on the same day.

53 Kerner, Dichtungen, 68.
made ill by winter’s snow. In the final strophe, the shoots make the persona’s heart beat more quietly.

There are several poetic tropes specific to “Erstes Grün.” First, we find the temporal progression from winter to spring, with winter representing a time of both hopelessness and darkness, spring representing promise. As a result, the birth of the new shoots signifies healing for the persona’s melancholy. Again, Kerner uses the association with nature to depict human consolation. In this particular instance, the persona’s longing for nature comes as a result of alienation: he is driven from society and nothing but new buds can bring him comfort.

“Erstes Grün,” also shares a similar use of apostrophe with the previous last poem in the last group, “Frage.” “Erstes Grün” features a slightly different version of addressing nature, however. In “Frage” the persona speaks to several aspects of nature in order to identify how it generally comforts him. “Erstes Grün,” however, focuses on one particular element that soothes the persona. Thus, while comfort in nature can come in more extraordinary ways (such as a star-bright night or birdsongs from heaven), it is also attainable through the simplest of means as well.

Schumann’s setting of “Erstes Grün” is one of the most straightforward of the Kerner poems, since the song is entirely strophic. Although the form may seem straightforward, there are some points where Schumann strays from Kerner’s poetic meter. Schumann follows it for the first two lines from the first stanza, but departs from it slightly for the third and fourth lines. For the setting of the third line at “das von,” the initial syllable is accented on a downbeat and longer notational value for “das” as we see in example 1.28. This is done similarly for the fourth line beginning on “o wie” (and similarly for “Drück’” and “Macht” in
subsequent stanzas). In doing so, Schumann emphasizes the physical aspects of the persona as he reacts to nature. The composer treats the examples of enjambment found in the poem similarly to previous songs in that he does not separate between the two lines of text (at “Grund” and “Drück”), thereby preserving syntax over poetic form (see ex. 1.29). A similar treatment between “gelegt” and “Macht” from the third strophe also occurs where the composer does not separate between the two lines (see ex. 1.30).

Example 1.28: mm. 5-8, “Erstes Grün”

Example 1.29: mm. 6-8, “Erstes Grün”

Example 1.30: mm. 6-8, “Erstes Grün”

“Stille Thränen”

Du bist vom Schlaf erstanden
Und wandelst durch die Au,
Da liegt ob allen Landen
Der Himmel wunderblau.

So lang du ohne Sorgen
Geschlummert schmerzenlos,
Der Himmel bis zum Morgen
Viel Thränen niedergoß.

You have arisen from sleep,
And wander through the meadow
Where over all the land lies,
The heaven’s wondrous blue.

While you were sleeping
Free from care and sorrow
The sky before the morning
Poured down many tears.

54 Schumann wrote out the verses for “Erstes Grün” underneath one another; however, the third verse received a slightly different treatment than the first. We will analyze the process by which he composed this song in the following chapter.

55 Ibid., 30.
In stillen Nächten weinet
Oft mancher aus den Schmerz,
Und Morgens dann ihr meinet,
Stets fröhlich sey sein Herz.

In the silence of the night,
Many a man cries in his pain,
And in the morning you would think,
That his heart would rejoice again.

“Stille Thränen” is the first of three consecutive texts in Langzeilenvers selected by Schumann in this phase of composition. In this example, both meter and cross-rhymes stay perfectly consistent throughout. There is one minor use of alliteration in the first stanza with “durch” and “du.” There are a number of enjambments in “Stille Thränen” between lines three and four of the first strophe, between lines one and two and then in three and four in the second strophe, and lines one and two and three and four in the third. The perspective of the poem appears not infrequently among Schumann’s selections of Kerner’s lieder in its use of second-person narration (see the following two selections).56

As in “Erstes Grün,” Kerner uses nature metaphorically here to compare unheard rainfall at night with human tears shed covertly in the darkness. Also similar to the previous poem is the notion of how time works for both nature and the persona. In “Stille Thränen,” the speaker cries at night in secret, and the morning should bring renewed hope, just as rain that falls at night does not disturb the dawn. The night is full of darkness (sorrow), which the dawn dispels in nature, but not for the speaker. And although the setting in the first strophe describes a beautiful morning, Kerner’s final notion leads one to question whether this passage is sufficient actually to ease human suffering. Through the promise of morning, after a night of release in weeping, the implication is that one’s heart is joyful. However, Kerner inserts a caveat to this sentiment by stating, “one would think.” Here, it appears that consolation is conditional.

56 “Stirb, Lieb’ und Freud’!,” offers third-person narration, but it belongs to the genre of the ballad rather than the lied, narrowly defined.
Schumann’s setting of “Stille Thränen” expands the poem from the rather small scale we find above to one of the longest settings of Kerner’s poems. The composer accomplishes this in two ways: by first establishing a rate of declamation of a dotted half note and then by use of a broad composed meter. Example 1.31 below shows just Schumann declaims the first two lines of poetry over eight measures, “very slowly.” Although Schumann’s entire setting of the poem follows the integrity of the Langzeilenvers scrupulously, his approach tends to blunt the metrical quality of the verse.

Example 1.31: mm. 1-9, “Stille Thränen”

Of particular importance is the way Schumann handles the frequent use of enjambment in Kerner’s poem. In each case, Schumann conforms to the poetic structure in preference to syntax by separating the lines with rests. For example, the first enjambment from the initial strophe, the lines are separated by three beats of rest (see ex. 1.32). At some points Schumann separates the lines even further by five beats of rest (see ex. 1.33).

Example 1.32: mm. 13-15, “Stille Thränen”

Example 1.33: mm. 29-30, “Stille Thränen”
“Wer machte dich so krank?”

Daß du so krank geworden,
Wer hat es denn gemacht?–
Kein kühler Hauch aus Norden,
Und keine Sternennacht.

Kein Schatten unter Bäumen,
Nicht Glut des Sonnenstrahls,
Kein Schlummern und kein Träumen
Im Blüthenbett’ des Thals.

Kein Trunk vom Felsensteine,
Kein Wein aus vollem Glas,
Der Baumesfrüchte keine,
Nicht Blume und nicht Gras.

Daß ich trag’ Todeswunden,
Das ist der Menschen Thun;
Natur ließ mich gesunden,
Sie lassen mich nicht ruhn.

That you have become so ill
Who brought that about?–
No cool northern wind,
Nor starry night.

No shadow under the trees,
Not the glow of the sunshine,
No sleep and no dreams
Among the valley’s flower beds.

No drink from a rocky crevice,
No wine from a full glass,
Nor fruits from a tree,
Not flowers and not grass.

That I bear mortal wounds,
Is the doing of human kind.
Nature made me well,
But people give me no peace.

“Wer machte dich so krank?” features pure cross rhyme throughout. There is one example of alliteration, the first of which occurs in the first line with “Daß” and “du.” The perspective of the poem comes from a persona who asks himself a rhetorical question, but the question itself is vague: the speaker believes he is ill and asks why. In the end, however, we discover that he blames others for his condition.

There are several poetic tropes in “Wer machte dich so krank?” The first stems directly from the perspective of the poem and appears similar to that of “Frage”: the persona reflects upon various aspects of nature that condition his happiness through a series of events that depict a progression from night to day. In this case, he admits to comfort in nature but blames mankind for his condition. As in “Erstes Grün,” the persona arrives at this conclusion due to his alienation from mankind.

57 Kerner, Dichtungen, 35.
The persona’s seclusion from human beings thus stands as the poetic conceit in “Wer machte dich so krank?” Through reflexive examination, the speaker realizes his melancholy is not due to nature. It is interesting to note that in this example, alienation from mankind is portrayed more emphatically than in previous texts. In “Erstes Grün” the persona notes his alienation from mankind, yet he provides no reason for it. “Wer machte dich so krank?” notes the specific results of his alienation: he bears mortal wounds. Though we are not privy to what caused them, the tone of the persona in this instance is more emphatic and morose.

In “Wer machte dich so krank?,” we find a similar treatment of the Langzeilenvers as in “Stille Thränen,” since this setting disguises the metrical quality of the verse somewhat. Unlike “Stille Thränen,” however—where its time signature and rate of declamation dissolve the meter of the Langzeilenvers—“Wer machte dich so krank?” features a slower rate of declamation because of its tempo (Langsam, leise) and the composer generally does not observe the poetic meter. This becomes evident immediately in the way Schumann ignores the iambic pattern and sets the first three words with the same notational value in example 1.34. The same holds true for the first line from the last stanza as well (see ex. 1.35).

58 Schumann incorrectly entered an extra half beat in the voice part for m. 1, but corrected it for the first edition.
This becomes especially apparent in the manner Schumann sets the penultimate line in the second stanza at “Kein Schlummern und kein Träumen,” where he splits the flow of the poetic line with a rest and alters the meter on “und kein” with repeated eighth notes as shown in example 1.36. Thus, Schumann’s setting of “Wer machte dich so krank?” appears to favor syntax over poetic form. As we learned above, the poetic conceit of this text deals specifically with alienation, and the persona is left to assess his situation through a series of self-examining questions. Schumann appears to be especially sensitive to this notion and presents us with a setting that strongly favors a declamatory style. In doing so, the declamation of the text does not follow Kerner’s poetic meter.

Example 1.36: mm. 12-14, “Wer machte dich so krank?”

```
Hörst du den Vogel singen?
Siehst du den Blüthenbaum?
Herz! kann dich das nicht bringen
Aus deinem bangen Traum?

Was hör’ ich? alte Laute
Wehmüth’ger Jünglingsbrust
Der Zeit als ich vertraute
Der Welt und ihrer Lust.

Die Tage sind gegangen,
Mich heilt kein Kraut der Flur;
Und aus dem Traum, dem bangen,
Weckt mich ein Engel nur.
```

Like the previous poem, “Alte Laute” is perfectly regular throughout in both its meter and rhyme scheme. The text is marked by several examples of alliteration. In the first strophe,

---

59 Ibid., 61.
“du” and “den” occur twice in the in the first two lines and is followed by “dich” and “das” in the third. The final strophe contains one example with “kein” and “Kraut” in the second lines. The use of enjambment is evident in the final two lines of the first strophe, the first and second couplet of the second strophe, and in the last stanza between the final couplet.

There are a number of poetic tropes that permeate “Alte Laute.” The text encompasses many of the themes from the poems Schumann selected to this point. First, there is a sonic description from the persona of a bird singing, followed by a description of nature in the blooming tree. We learn he is speaking to his heart, and he suggests that these items are something that might wake him from his unsettling dream. Nostalgia and alienation follow in the next strophe. Finally, the persona alludes to death. As with “Frage,” “Alte Laute” presents these various possibilities in the form self-reflection: the persona contemplates his surroundings, both past and present, to determine his current condition.

Unlike several of the texts that portray the consolation in nature, “Alte Laute” articulates nature’s inability to console the persona outright, and as a result, he is resigned to death. The chronology of the poem turns itself against nature: the persona acknowledges it in the first strophe; in the second stanza, he contrasts the birdsongs with sounds from his past, which lead him to better memories. Through nostalgia, he becomes aware of his current state and recognizes that it cannot be healed. Here too, sonic descriptions work differently than in other poems. In previous texts, such as “Frage,” Stille Liebe,” and “Trost im Gesang,” references to song or sonic descriptions suggest the power to heal the individual. However in “Alte Laute,” the sounds from his past lead him to a malaise that nature cannot restore.
Although “Alte Laute” is similar in its melodic structure to “Wer machte dich so krank?,” there is a major difference between the two in how their texts are declaimed. Though both blunt the meter through placement of poetic anacruses on musical downbeats, we found that the rate of declamation wavers between three notes (eighth, dotted eighth, and quarter) in the previous song. But a dotted eighth is used throughout “Alte Laute.” Thus, we find a subtly additional hesitance to the declamation (see ex. 1.37). While the latter song shows no distinction between the first and second syllables in the first line of text, Schumann emphasizes “du” by setting it on a dotted eighth note. We saw in the previous song that Schumann separated lines mainly through the use of rests (as noted in ex. 1.37), and since the composer proceeds similarly in “Alte Laute,” this reinforces each of the enjambed lines in the poem. Thus is the case for the enjambment found in the first stanza (see ex. 1.38).

Example 1.37: mm. 1-4, “Alte Laute”

Example 1.38: mm. 5-6, “Alte Laute”

A final difference between the two settings appears in their concluding measures. In “Wer machte dich so krank?,” Schumann separates the final two lines of the poem as shown in example 1.39. He proceeds differently for “Alte Laute” by connecting the final lines, and concludes with a slightly varied rhythmic and melodic approach (see ex. 1.40). Here he

---

60 We shall explore the possibility that both of these songs were composed on or about the same day in the next chapter.
Example 1.39: mm. 21-23, “Wer machte dich so krank?”

Example 1.40: mm. 20-23, “Alte Laute” overrides the break between the lines, subverting the enjambment in favor of syntactic continuity. These are not the only differences, however. Schumann also changes the melodic contour of the penultimate word by adding a grace note and approaches the tonic from B flat rather than G as in the previous song.

Phase III

By the middle of December 1840, Schumann had selected eleven texts by Kerner for setting, and a notation in his diary makes it apparent that he still planned to continue. For the week from 6 to 13 December he wrote “the Kerner cycle is close to being finished and much from the past few days will find its way to print.”

He must have believed that he had not produced a satisfying collection yet (especially after calling the initial seven texts a cycle in November), and he continued to work therefore (an issue I will explore later in Chapter 3).

After a brief pause, then, Schumann set new texts by Kerner until the end of December 1840. The third phase of composition, while containing the fewest number of texts, addressed some of Kerner’s more complex verse with regard to meter, length, and poetic conceit. Table III lists the last few selections Schumann made for his Kerner cycle.

---

61 TblII, 132. “der J. Kerner’sche Cyklus ist bis auf weniges fertig, und überhaupt manches zum Druck gewandert in den letzten Tagen.”
### Table 1.3: Selection of Texts, Phase III

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Song Title</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Date Source</th>
<th>Dichtungen</th>
<th>Gedichtabschriften</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Sängers Trost”</td>
<td>18.12.40</td>
<td>LbIII</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Sehnsucht nach der Waldgegend”</td>
<td>23.12.40</td>
<td>TbIII</td>
<td>87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Wanderlied”</td>
<td>29.12.40</td>
<td>LbIII</td>
<td>92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**“Sängers Trost”** 62

Weint auch einst kein Liebchen
Thränen auf mein Grab;
Träufeln doch die Blumen
Milden Thau hinab;

Although there is no sweetheart
To weep over my grave
Flowers will drop
Their gentle dew there.

Weilt an ihm kein Wanderer
Im Vorüberlauf;
Blickt auf seiner Reise
Doch der Mond darauf.

Though no traveler lingers there
In passing by;
On its journey
The moon will still gaze down.

Denkt auf diesen Fluren
Bald kein Erd’ner mein;
Denkt doch mein die Aue
Und der stille Hain.

In these meadows
No living soul will remember me;
Yet the field will recall
And the silent grove.

Blumen, Hain und Aue,
Stern und Mondenlicht,
Die ich sang, vergessen
Ihres Sängers nicht.

Flowers, grove and meadow,
Stars and moonlight,
Those of whom I sung
Will not forget their singer.

“Sängers Trost” possesses a pattern similar to *Langzeilenvers* in its metrical design.

However, instead of an iambic scheme, the underlying meter is trochaic, with even-numbered lines ending in a silent syllable. The cross rhymes features a combination of pure and impure schemes. All even-numbered lines maintain pure rhymes yet the odd-numbered lines, with the exception of the first strophe, do not rhyme. There are also examples of alliteration in the first three strophes and all involve the word “doch”: in the first stanza, “doch” and “die,”

---

“doch” and “der” in the second, and “Denkt” and doch” in the third. In addition, all of the final couplets feature enjambment.

“Sängers Trost” combines several poetic tropes we have seen previously: the persona hints at lost love, alienation, consolation in nature, death, and the power of song. Kerner uses conflicting juxtaposition within each of the first three strophes to outline the plight of the persona, over whose unvisited tomb nature will watch. While the persona finds comfort in nature, he laments his alienation. In the first stanza, then, no beloved will weep for him, but the flowers on his grave will with their dew. The second and third strophes reiterate through in the form of the moon, meadow, and field remembering him after he is gone. The fourth stanza gives the reason: he sings of them. The persona in “Sängers Trost” pays homage to both himself and nature. While he laments the possibilities of his grave being unvisited by any human soul, he finds solace in the fidelity of nature, giving the reason for its constancy. Therefore, we might think of the poetic conceit as two-fold: the “comfort” found in nature derives from his attention to it.

For the setting of “Sängers Trost,” we find a declamatory vocal part that utilizes the upper tessitura of the voice as we see in example 1.41. Further, “Sängers Trost” is almost entirely strophic. For the first two strophes, the declamation of the text is almost unrelieved in its faithfulness to the trochaic meter of the verse. However, the composer varies the declamation of the text for the third stanza and departs from the strophic setting for the fourth. We find the first example of this for the setting of the second line from the third stanza where Schumann produces a slight variance in voice part at “bald kein” by offsetting the rhythm from the downbeat of the measure with an eighth rest (see ex. 1.42). This also occurs in the very same way for the fourth line of the stanza on “und.”
The setting of the fourth stanza differs in several ways. While the rhythmic approach to the first line is similar to previous stanzas, the melody begins a major third higher. Next, Schumann provides alternate notes in the voice for the setting of the second line, which follow the usual meter, while the lower stray from it in the same we found for the second line of the third stanza (by beginning with an eighth rest as we find in ex. 1.43).

The third and fourth lines display an entirely different approach. First, the trochaic pattern is initially offset for the beginning of the third line at “die” where it begins on an offbeat (see ex. 1.44). The trochaic pattern then returns with a longer notational value on “sang.” But Schumann alters the meter once again in the next measure where he shortchanges the final syllable of “vergessen” with an eighth note. This, however, allows for the proper stress of the following line to fall on a strong beat for “ihres.”
Wär’ ich nie aus euch gegangen,  
Wälder, hehr und wunderbar!
Hielten liebend mich umfangen 
Doch so lange, lange Jahr!—

Wo in euren Dämmerungen
Vogel sang und Silberquell,
Ist auch manches Lied entsprungen
Meinem Busen, frisch und hell;

Eure Wogen, eure Halle,
Euer Säuseln nimmer müd,
Eure Melodieen alle
Weckten in der Brust das Lied.
Hier in diesen weiten Triften
Ist mir alles öd und stumm,
Und ich schau’ in blauen Lüften
Mich nach Wolkenbildern um.

Wenn ihr’s in den Busen zwinget,
Regt sich selten nur das Lied;
Wie der Vogel halb nur singet,
Den vom Baum und Bach man schied.

Of the final three selections, “Sehnsucht nach der Waldgegend” displays the most prosaic rhyme structure: it is written in trochaic tetrameter and with cross rhyme. With the exception of “müd” and “Lied” in the third strophe, all of the end rhymes are pure. Enjambment occurs between each couplet in the first stanza, and over the course of the entire second and third strophes. The perspective of the poem begins as a conditional response from the persona in the first three strophes as he describes his past surroundings in the forest. This changes in the

63 Ibid., 87.
final stanzas where he intimates his displacement among the broad pastures of his present course.

Although inspiration from nature stands as an important poetic trope in this instance, the persona places greater emphasis on one aspect of nature over another and develops other important tropes from this imbalance. First, the persona uses nostalgia to describe a forest from his past, which was his home for many years. He acknowledges his past surroundings not only as a “loving” home, but also as an inspiration for his song. He also hints that he is wayfaring through broad pastures, among which he feels out of place. This becomes evident first as he describes the absence of sound: gone are the birdsongs and echoing streams from his forest. In his desolation, he makes an analogy to the situation of a bird taken from its tree losing its will to sing. Kerner brings this poetic conceit to light through disparate juxtaposition. The persona’s displacement (possibly through travelling) to sparse surroundings allows him to recognize the importance of his past. This point is understood from the initial line of the poem in which he speaks directly to the forest itself: were he not to have left it, he would not feel isolated. Yet the conceit might be two-fold. With the conclusion of the metaphor in the final strophe, the persona’s muted song might also portend his lost will to live.

The vocal part for “Sehnsucht nach der Waldgegend” utilizes a wide range and a number of rising and falling fifths and sixths throughout. Furthermore, Schumann uses the same time signature he used for “Stille Thränen,” 6/4, but with the opposite result from the setting of this earlier number. First, Schumann connects almost all of the lines from the text instead of separating them with rests, as in the former song. Next, while he begins with a rate of declamation at a half note for the first half of the initial stanza, he alternates between a rate
of a dotted quarter and eighth notes for the remainder of the first strophe as well as for the inner stanzas as shown in examples 1.45 and 1.46. As a result, he manages to fit the much longer “Sehnsucht nach der Waldgegend” into a shorter space, in contrast to the significantly longer setting of “Stille Thrän.“

As we learned above, “Sehnsucht nach der Waldgegend” uses enjambment more than any other of Schumann’s Kerner selections. In every case of enjambment, the composer prizes syntax over poetic form by running the end of one line directly into the next, as is the case with the enjambment found between the third and fourth lines of the third stanza at “alle” and “weckten,” shown in Example 1.47.

We also find examples where Schumann runs against the trochaic tetrameter of the poem. The first is found in the initial measure of the song, where the trochee is not preserved in the first half of the measure since “Wär” begins on an agogic accent by virtue of its displacement (see ex. 1.45). This also holds true for the third and fourth lines of the first stanza, where the initial words of both “Hielten” and “doch so” respectively, unfold over two eighth notes and serve as pick-ups to their next measure as we see in example 1.48. The
composer sets the initial trochee for each line of stanzas two through four in this way, as well.

Example 1.48: mm. 4-6, “Sehnsucht nach der Waldgegend”

“Wanderlied” 64

Wohlauf! noch getrunken
Den funkelnden Wein!
Ade nun, ihr Lieben!
Geschieden muß seyn.
Ade nun, ihr Berge,
Du väterlich Haus!
Es treibt in die Ferne
Mich mächtig hinaus.

Die Sonne, sie bleibt noch
Am Himmel nicht stehn,
Es treibt sie, durch Länder
Und Meere zu gehen.
Die Woge nicht haftet
Am einsamen Strand,
Die Stürme, sie brausen
Mit Macht durch das Land.

Mit eilenden Wolken
Der Vogel dort zieht,
Und singt in der Ferne
Ein heimatlich Lied.
So treibt es den Burschen
Durch Wälder und Feld,
Zu gleichen der Mutter,
Der wandernden Welt.

Da grüßen ihn Vögel
Bekannt über’m Meer,
Sie flogen von Fluren
Der Heimat hierher,
Da duften die Blumen
...and so on...

64 Ibid., 92-93.
Schumann’s final selection from Kerner’s verse came in the form of the drinking song “Wanderlied.” The poem consists of five octaves in dactylic dimeter, with a syllable of upbeat for each couplet. Beginning in the second strophe, the end-rhymes change from pure to impure for the odd-numbered lines, and with the exception of first and final strophe, there are several examples of alliteration in the body of the poem. From his internal perspective the persona initially proclaims his desire to travel and follows with the reasons a young man is compelled to do so.

There are a number of poetic tropes in “Wanderlied.” First, there is the notion that the persona is about to travel from his homeland, which he justifies through the various “wandering” aspects of nature. Nature not only provides his reason to travel but also will accompany him or any wanderer. The speaker also notes how his love will make him feel “at home” in his travels. This notion is important to his future wayfaring: no matter how far he strays from his homeland, he is only removed physically, not spiritually. Something in his travels will always remind him of his home.

The tone of “Wanderlied” is quite different from most of the preceding poems. While several have intimated a persona’s alienation from mankind and note that traveling results from lost love, “Wanderlied” asserts the necessity of travel. The context for the persona in
this case is positive: at no point does he mention an unfortunate event that leads him away. On the contrary, his need to travel is supported by his own sense of home, nature, friends, and love, since he feels they will always be with him. The impetus for his travel appears in the first stanza: “An urge from afar drives me strongly away,” though we do not discover the exact cause that drives the young man from his home.

Schumann’s setting of “Wanderlied” begins as a lively march with uneven rhythms that give way to the standard alteration of a regular march (see ex. 1.49). The first three stanzas represent a quintessential wanderer’s march, which is interspersed with a lyrical B section for the fourth and fifth strophes, followed by a repeat of the first stanza (both music and the text) as the song’s conclusion.

Schumann recasts the dimeter of which the poem by combining couplets in “Wanderlied” to form quatrains in dactylic tetrameter with an upbeat at the beginning of each group. But he also intimates the original form by creating a caesura between each of the couplets by placing the final word of lines (such as “getrunken,” “Wein,” “sein,” and so forth) on longer note values.

The Subject Matter of Kerner’s Poetry

65
Now that we have examined the structure and basic meaning of Schumann’s selections from Kerner, we can view the underlying theme in their poetic content. Although individual interpretations of the fourteen texts reveal a variety of conceits, their overall content falls into the category of nostalgia as outlined in Fred Davis’ *Yearning for Yesterday: A Sociology of Nostalgia*, and Peter Fritzsche’s *Stranded in the Present: Modern Time and the Melancholy of History*.65

The origin of nostalgia is from the Greek *nostros*, which is to return home, and *algia*, a painful condition. Johannes Hofer first coined the term during the late seventeenth century to designate the condition of extreme homesickness among Swiss mercenaries who were fighting far from their native land.66 Later, in 1731, German-Swiss J. J. Scheuchzer suggested nostalgia arose from the sufferer’s exposure to a different atmosphere, which caused excessive body pressurization, thereby producing an observed affliction of sentiment.67 While early understandings of nostalgia involved both military and medical associations, in the decades prior to the turn of the twentieth century, according to Fred Davis, people no longer considered it a “disease” in the conventional medical sense nor limited its incidence only to persons in the military.68 The modern view has generalized nostalgia to include longing for chronologically anterior objects or phenomena no longer accesible. For Davis, “Almost anything from our past can emerge as an object of nostalgia, provided that we can somehow view it in a pleasant light.”69

---


66 Davis, *Yearning for Yesterday*, 1.

67 Ibid., 2.
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The past, and longing for it, represents, then, a motivational source for the nostalgic experience. The condition, however, must draw on a personally experienced past rather than one taken solely from history books or legend. Although nostalgic material is derived from something personally experienced, Davis states that the past does not cause nor does it explain the motivational source for the nostalgic experience. Rather, that which occasions us to, “feel nostalgia must also reside in the present, regardless of how much the ensuing nostalgic experience may draw its sustenance from our memory of the past.” Thus, “Whatever in our present situation evokes it, nostalgia uses the past—falsely, accurately, or…in specially reconstructed ways—but it is not the product thereof.”

With an understanding of what defines the source of the nostalgic experience, Davis raises the issue of how anterior the past must be to be experienced as such? In other words, how much time must pass for the events in one’s life to become the object of nostalgia? Davis suggests that this involves more than mere chronological time. Rather, experiential-time facilitates nostalgic perception. More importantly, the ability to experience nostalgia “has less…to do with how recent or distant these events are than with the way they contrast—or, more accurately, the way we make them contrast—with the events, moods and dispositions of our present circumstances.” Consequently, we may treat nostalgia as a past imbued with special qualities that attain their importance from the ways we juxtapose them to particular features of our present lives. While the relationship between past and present defines the nostalgic experience, the question remains whether we can feel nostalgia for the future. In essence, can we envision ourselves at a distant point in our lives “looking back”

70 Ibid., 10-11.
71 Ibid., 12.
nostalgically on occurrences we anticipate? According to Davis, we can understand this retrospective feature of nostalgia in a forward projection of an unrealized state.72 This might occur through our own anticipation of the conventional processes of marriage, purchase of a home, birth of children, or success at work; nostalgia thus acquires a sociological significance.

The importance of nostalgia in relating our past to present and future allows for a “readily accessible psychological [lens] we employ in the never ending work of constructing, maintaining, and reconstructing our identities.”73 Nostalgia therefore provides a distinctive way in which we create a sense of who we are. Yet how does nostalgia function as a part of our quest for personal identity? Davis’s notion of viewing nostalgia as anything from our past seen in a pleasant light offers one explanation. In a sense, nostalgia “bestows upon us a certain current worth, however much present circumstances may obscure it or make it suspect.”74 Though one’s past might have gone awry or entailed injuries, Davis writes that, “Nostalgic feeling is almost never infused with those sentiments we commonly think of as negative—for example, unhappiness, frustration, despair, hate, shame, abuse.”75 Moreover, if certain pains from the past, “intrude at all, [they] filter forgivingly through an ‘it-was-all-for-the-best’ attitude or, at the very least, are patronized under some ‘great human comedy’ metaphor.” Even though we might have felt disorientation in the past, the fact that we have emerged from “it all intact and possibly even enhanced, so we shall again.”76

72 Ibid.
73 Ibid., 31.
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Nostalgia therefore thrives on certain transitions, even discontinuities that “engender our yearning for continuity.” Davis writes that the nostalgic reaction to transition is most pronounced at certain phases of life, in which we experience the greatest demands for change of identity (such as pubescence, adolescence and so forth). In addition, nostalgia thrives on historical transitions, especially discontinuities and dislocations brought about by such phenomena as depression, war, and natural disasters, or by “those events that cause masses of people to feel uneasy and to wonder whether the world and their being are quite what they always took them to be.” While Davis admits that identity discontinuity does not have an exact causal relationship to the nostalgic reaction, he explains that because it is nearly impossible to understand nostalgia in a world of unrelieved continuity (i.e., a world without transition), so is it as difficult to think of it in a world of ceaseless discontinuity.

Finally, Davis explains nostalgia as an essential factor in shaping our identities as an appreciative stance towards the self. By retrieving the worth of our past, nostalgia becomes, in essence, a form of consciousness characterized as a heightened focus on things past with an enhanced credence in them, accompanied by musing, mild detachment from affairs of everyday life, an essentially appreciative stance toward the self, and relief in a sense of common identity which everyday life constrains and frames our conduct.

While Fred Davis’s work portrays the perceptual basis of nostalgia, Peter Fritzche takes an historic view of the meanings we attach to the past. Fritzche’s study focuses on Europe in the years following the French Revolution and on the ways that people reformatted
notions of time and history. Though his work focuses on Europe as a whole, my survey of his work will deal specifically with his study of Germany.

In the aftermath of the French Revolution, Fritzsche writes, “The past was conceived more and more as something bygone and lost, and also strange and mysterious, and although partially accessible, always remote. The disconnection from the past was a source of melancholy…but it also prompted a search for new ways to understand difference.”79 While the past was distant and, no longer accessible through immediate visible events, it became available for interpretation. In many ways, the Revolution dramatized an historical change by introducing different ways of thinking about the past as a “felt absence that could (be) mourned but not regained.” Furthermore, people were, “more willing to allow a variety of subjects and artifacts to evoke the national idea, and more sensitive to the broken-downness of the imagined unity that spurred nostalgic memory work in the first place.”

Fritzsche further explains this sense of transformation from past to present in an example from Eichendorff’s sketches, in which a traveler on a railroad journey reflects on a number of impressions that pass by. During his journey a half-demolished castle comes into view, and he asks the fellow passengers for the name, meaning, and origin of the ruin. Although none of them provide specific answers, they know it is inhabited by a hermit. None had actually seen him, but in the end, a lady from Berlin muses that the hermit must be “the last Romantic,” since he had escaped modern progress for the solitude of the medieval castle.81

79 Fritzsche, Stranded in the Present, 5.
80 Ibid.
81 Ibid., 2
Fritzsche maintains that the conceit of Eichendorff’s story places the reader in a modern landscape, in which the present has rendered the past anachronistic. Though the traveler’s journey enforces the distance from the castle, it also provides for its exploration. The climb up to the castle, “the story’s proposed plot, indicates that modernity is not simply determined by the imperatives of the present, but sustains the desire to explore a strange and remote past.” Eventually, the traveler encounters the hermit, whose appearance makes him feel as if he had been “magically transported back to the good old days.”

In a similar way, Friedrich Schlegel was interested in the preserving a historical vision for Germany. Schlegel arrived in Paris during the Peace of Amiens (1802-03), where he studied philosophy and eastern languages and encountered a number of ruins on the Rhine along the way. This inspired him to outline a historical vision for Germany which he published in his Europa that fall. Schlegel writes, “Nowhere are the memories of what the Germans once were and what they could be so alive as along the Rhine.” The Rhineland, “offered a compact space in which the chain of ‘hills, cities, and villages along the wonderful stream’ could be reconstructed as ‘a whole,’ were it not for ‘the deplorable fragmentation of the unity of countries and nation.’” Fritzsche claims that Schlegel felt the very force of destruction allowed for reconstitution: “what was once great and beautiful is so totally destroyed, that I do not know in what way one can argue that Europe as a whole is still with us.” In reading the historical landscape as a ruin, he attempted to imagine other historical constructions than Napoleon’s Europe.
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These notions from Davis and Fritzsche provide a basis for understanding Schumann’s selections of Kerner’s texts, where nostalgia is pervasive. For the persona in the composer’s selections, reconstruction (and remembrance) of the past surfaces in a variety of ways that offers a glimpse into how nostalgia works. In many ways, Kerner’s verse works in the manner proposed by Davis: his speakers’ present situations occasion his nostalgia. His memories and their perceived sense of worth are then used to reflect upon his present situation in his travels. We are initially presented with this subject through the poetic conceit of “Wanderung.” Memories of a beloved allow the persona to reflect upon the course which has led him away from his homeland. His present surroundings are unfamiliar; however, through the process of recollection, his current surroundings are no longer foreign in light of his beloved. In essence, the memory of her “token of love” binds him to his present course.

The element of memory is also specific to “Auf das Trinkglas eines verstorbenen Freundes,” where the persona recalls a friend’s death through a memento mori. Here, nostalgia for the persona is recalled by the mere presence of a glass, which signifies not only his departed friend, but also his transformation to a new space that is seemingly timeless.

Even though the glass is empty, in its depths the holy sound still echoes. In this context, the remembrance of his friend also serves a religious connection, when he compares the wine in it to “precious blood.” Thus, we find that his memory serves him in two ways: to reflect upon the departed which, in turn, brings him to his present situation, where he is transfigured spiritually.

While the persona uses nostalgia to contemplate his present course in a positive way in the examples above, we cannot say the same for “Wer machte dich so krank?” or “Alte Laute.” In the former selection, the persona lists objects from his past as a means of
questioning his present “ill” condition. In this case, each of the items he queries comes from a previous experience (in most cases, from nature) be it a cool wind, the glow of the sunshine, sleep or dreams, flowers or grass. In the end he comes to the conclusion that his current state is a result of his past; however, nature has not led him to sorrow. His “mortal wounds” result from humankind. Through his nostalgic recollection we discover two things: the various objects in nature he has experienced and that these elements in his life that bring him comfort.

“Alte Laute” further echoes this sentiment, where reflections of the persona’s sentimental past lead him to an understanding that the present situation has no resolution, save death. In this case, we find the persona comparing his present to his past. He cannot acknowledge the singing bird nor the blooming tree. Instead, he is taken back in time to his youth where he can only hear the sounds he recalls when he felt peace in the world. We see again in this instance a form of contemplation of the past by way of self-reflection; however, the conclusion does not parallel his current state. Although the persona places emphasis on his past in all the above texts, just two elicit a positive outcome. In “Alte Laute,” however, the present course compares unfortunately to the past thus resulting in death. In a sense, we might think of his nostalgia for the past as an irretrievable loss.

Although the majority of the Kerner texts deal in some way with a persona’s nostalgic recollections (or at the least, recall a situation he has experienced), two in particular, “Sehnsucht nach der Waldgegend” and “Wanderlied” stand as the best examples of how nostalgia plays such an important role as a poetic conceit in Schumann’s selections. In the former text, we are first introduced to a conditional response from the persona that underscores the very definition of nostalgia. Here, the persona longs for the forests which had
surrounded him for so many years. There he found a sense of self-worth: he intimates that his past “home” provides a source for his song. At the same time, he accords his past more significance, because he has juxtaposed it with the deserted expanses of his present course. Consequently, there is a certain feeling of superiority he feels in his nostalgic sentiment for his past. The persona, moreover, constructs his own personal identity as a result of what he realizes as important: while the transition to his present course provides discontinuity, his nostalgic reaction to the past fosters the point in his life in which he personally most identifies his self-worth.

“Wanderlied” presents a similar feature of nostalgia; however, the perception of the present and future for the persona is completely different. Though he bids farewell to his homeland, the persona establishes his space in the future through what he will encounter along the way to remind him of his past. Thus, the three texts chosen by Schumann reveal the wanderer’s present course before his travels, and his past in order to arrive at the future. This chronological feature of nostalgia that allows one to project forward is evident in the birds and flowers from his homeland which will greet him. In addition to nature, the memory of his beloved will also be his companion, to make him feel “at home.” In essence, he feels connected to his days of old, allowing for his hope of the future. We might further think of the persona’s course as a dialectical process associated with his destiny. As described by Davis, this nostalgic sentiment is a type of “forward projection of an as yet unrealized state.” This is true for the persona who essentially looks to the future with nostalgia.

We have seen, then, that Schumann advanced purposefully to craft a coherent opus featuring the verse of a favorite poet from his sentimental teenage years, but this time in possession of his full compositional powers. I have suggested that Schumann worked in three
distinct phases during late 1840 with the intention of collecting Kerner’s verse into a coherent opus. In the case of each poem, I viewed how the composer initially declaimed Kerner’s verse as opposed to how it originally scanned. Finally, I have noted the ways in which the composer selected poems that address specific themes (love, love lost, wandering, nature, comfort in nature, nostalgia, and death) that could possibly result in wayfarer’s song cycle. But before we can see how this collection emerged in its final, published form, we must first examine the compositional process surrounding these 1840 Kerner Lieder, not in their hypothetical melodic sketches, but in the autograph sources that do exist: the composer’s first full realizations of these songs in one of the so-called Berlin Liederbücher. Only after we view the various layers of text and musical considerations in these realizations over the course of Chapter 2 we can begin to identify the process by which Schumann arrived at op. 35 as a finished entity.
Chapter II: Compositional Process

Now that we have a sense of how Schumann selected and declaimed texts by Kerner, we may analyze the process by which he realized his sketches in score. In his study of the sources for Dichterliebe, also composed during the “Liederjahr,” Rufus Hallmark gives “an overview of the logical, step-by-step process of Lied composition that Schumann by and large followed.”

After selecting verse, Schumann next devised a melodic setting, as we have seen in Chapter 1. This procedure usually entailed vocal sketches of a particular text, which according to Hallmark, resulted in “not at all a fragmentary idea, but rather a complete or nearly complete voice part, fully texted.” In some instances the composer briefly indicated some ideas for the piano part; however, a great majority of the available sketches show that Schumann had a nearly complete written version of the vocal part before he began composing the accompaniment. In Hallmark’s view, this compositional procedure differed greatly from the composer’s earlier habit of “fantasizing at the piano,” and he quotes Robert’s letter to Clara: “I mostly compose them [songs] standing or walking around, not at the piano. It is an entirely different kind of music, which does not come first through my fingers but much more

---


2 Ibid. We find examples of this at http://www.juilliardmanuscriptcollection.org/home.html for two of Schumann’s songs: “Widmung,” op. 25 no. 1, and “Stille Liebe.”

3 Ibid., 22.
directly and melodiously.”⁴ These sketches can show not only the earliest compositional decisions made by Schumann in setting text, but they can also reveal the composer’s planning of a song cycle as well. In the case of *Dichterliebe*, however, the sketches show neither the sixteen-song published cycle nor the set of *20 Lieder und Gesänge* that appears in the autograph score. Rather, according to Hallmark, the sketches constitute “the first projection of a *Liederreihe* of undetermined length.”⁵

In the next compositional stage Schumann drafted a complete realization, adding piano music to the already sketched vocal melody. At this point, “some further emendation both of [the piano’s] initial version and of the vocal line [was] made.” We find this phase of composition for most of Schumann’s early songs in the three autograph *Liederbücher* in the Berlin Staatsbibliothek. According to Hallmark, the songs in the Berlin autograph “correspond fairly well to the category of complete draft.” In one rare case, op. 24, these autographs even served as an engraving manuscript or *Stichvorlage*.

The Berlin *Liederbücher* feature paper with 12-staves (33 x 25.5 cm) ruled in blue ink.⁶ Due to the fact that the beginning and ending of staves are so uneven, the paper may not originally have been music paper: it appears that someone (possibly the composer) ruled it with a rastrum. All three volumes contain a table of contents, noting the order of the songs with a corresponding number. The first volume contains songs numbered one through fifty, bearing dates from February, March, and April of 1840, and includes songs that would become opp. 24, 27, 33, 51, and 57. The second volume, largest of the three, contains songs

---


⁵ The following description of Schumann’s process for composing songs comes from Hallmark, *Genesis*, 18.

⁶ Ibid.
from May through July numbered 51-108. Some of the major cycles from 1840 appear in this volume, including opp. 39, 42, 48, and it also contains the songs that would appear as opp. 30, 36, 31, 40, and 49. The last volume contains songs 109-147 composed during the latter portions of 1840 and later. This particular volume is like the first in that it contains realizations for both for some of Schumann’s smaller collections, such as opp. 37, 43 and 53, and also for the Kerner settings from the end 1840, which would become op. 35.

Unfortunately, there appear to be no extant melodic sketches for the fourteen Kerner songs, (though it is likely that Schumann worked from sketches as he produced the piano drafts of the songs, as we shall see later). Our only clues about Schumann’s decisions in composing the Kerner Lieder lie in the third volume of the Berlin realizations (LbIII). The songs appear after the entry of “Klage eines Mädchens” (or “Mädchen-Schwermuth”), later to become the third song of Vier Gesänge, op. 142.⁷ Table 2.1 lists the order of the songs Schumann realized for op. 35, their key signatures, the pages on which they fall with the corresponding number given by Schumann in the table of contents found at the beginning of LbIII, and the dates indicated by the composer. The dates entered by Schumann more than likely indicate the days on which the songs were sketched. We might recall that the composer provided dates for most of these songs in TbIII in addition to the Berlin autograph. In only one case, “Trost im Gesang,” do the two manuscripts differ on chronology.

The numbering of the manuscript, however, is much more complex than the table of contents suggests. First, two sets of numbers appear above the head of each song in LbIII.

---

⁷ Schumann initially listed this song as “Klage eines Mädchens” in the table of contents for LbIII. At the head of the song’s realization, he wrote “Schwermuth im Frühling,” which the Verzeichnis catalog also lists as its title; ibid., 798. The published title for the song was “Mädchen-Schwermuth.”
Table 2.1: Order of the Realizations for the Kerner Songs in *LbIII*[^8]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Song Title</th>
<th>Key</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Song Number</th>
<th>Date Composed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) “Lust der Sturmnacht”</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>20.11.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) “Stirb, Lieb’ und Freud’!”</td>
<td>A flat</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>22.11.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) “Trost im Gesang”</td>
<td>E flat</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>20.11.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) “Wanderung”</td>
<td>B flat</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>23.11.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) “An das Trinkglas eines verstorbenen Freundes”</td>
<td>E flat</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>25.11.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) “Stille Liebe”</td>
<td>E flat</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>24.11.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) “Stille Thränen”</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>7.12.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) “Frage”</td>
<td>E flat</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>11.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9) “Wer machte Dich so krank?”</td>
<td>A flat</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>11.12.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10) “Alte Laute”</td>
<td>A flat</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>no date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11) “Sehnsucht nach der Waldgegend”</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>no date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12) “Erstes Grün”</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>7.12.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13) “Sängers Trost”</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>18.12.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14) “Wanderlied”</td>
<td>B flat</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>29.12.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each of them bears one number lower than originally indicated by Schumann. The numbers were apparently altered later in another hand to reflect the table of contents in a second hand, possibly Clara’s. Secondly, the order of the songs in *LbIII* does not correspond to the

[^8]: The source for this chart, as well as all further references to *LbIII* comes from Robert Schumann, *Liederbuch III*, autograph drafts of songs bound in three volumes, Music Division, Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin, Preußischer Kulturbesitz, Mus. ms. autogr. 16.

[^9]: Schumann placed the original title of Kerner’s poem (‘‘An das Trinkglas eines Verstorbenen Freundes’’) in the left margin of the realization. At some point, he changed this and it appears as ‘‘Auf das Trinkglas eines Verstorbenen Freundes’’ for the first edition. All references to this number throughout my dissertation will refer to its status in the first edition, which is also how it is listed in the Verzeichnis catalog.
chronology of sketching, and that prompts the question of whether the order of the songs in 
$LbIII$ presents a possible narrative. In chapter one, we noted that the order in which 
Schumann selected Kerner’s verse did not seem to portend a specific narrative trajectory, and 
it appears that the same notion applies to its realizations in the $Liederbücher$.

Since the order of the songs entered does not match the chronology of their 
composition or even come close to resembling their final order in the first edition, it appears 
that Schumann entered the songs into $LbIII$ merely in a loose chronological fashion and 
postponed arranging them as a cycle until a later time. We only know that at this point the 
vast majority of the songs were composed in flat keys.

Another question concerns what compositional stage exactly the Berlin piano drafts 
represented for Schumann’s Kerner settings. While Hallmark suggests the composer’s initial 
intention to use the Berlin drafts as engraving exemplars, only one cycle from the 
$Liederbücher$, the op. 24 $Liederkreis$, served this purpose. This is not to say that the 
composer did not leave specific instructions for engraving in the manuscript. In the case of 
$Dichterliebe$, for instance, Schumann placed some marginal notes in the drafts about 
engraving. The composer wrote the music out for “Im wunderschönen Monat Mai” only once 
and placed the second stanza under the first. In a footnote near the repeat sign, however, he 
wrote, “Beim Stich bitte ich den 2ten Vers auszustechen.”\textsuperscript{10} This type of instruction also 
appears for “Erstes Grün,” where Schumann simply wrote each verse under the same music. 
We find another example of this in “Wanderlied,” where a marginal notation, 
“auszuschreiben” for a passage of repeated music suggests that a copyist served as an 
intermediary. Such instructions for the Kerner songs do not mean that the autographs served 
as engraving exemplars. As we shall discover, the manuscript Kerner songs are too messy to
serve an engraver. Many of the song entries contain alterations that would make production of an edition difficult. Therefore, the entries in the Liederbücher simply represent piano drafts that would provide the basis for fair copies at a later time.

The following analysis focuses on the differences Schumann produced within the Berlin drafts as he realized the Kerner songs and also between the autograph and the first edition versions in order to show the layers of compositional decisions Schumann made. Since there are no extant sketches for the 1840 Kerner songs, an analysis of these stages of composition provides our only “glimpse into the composer’s workshop.”

In general, the types of revisions we find in the Liederbücher take three forms. In the first Schumann produced revisions “on the spot,” so to speak, in the same shade of ink. We find these where the composer crossed out a note or a passage and immediately changed it during the initial stage of entering a song. Such revisions might have been the result of Schumann copying the melody from his sketches incorrectly and immediately finding he had erred. We see this when the composer mistakenly placed a note on the wrong line or space, a common copying error. The second situation proves more complicated and revealing: these revisions show where Schumann opted for something different from his initial conception and recomposed it during a later pass. These appear in the form of individual notes or phrases that were edited in a different shade of ink. The first layer of realizations for the songs were done in a darker shade of ink and it seems that he revised them at a later time by marking his changes in a lighter shade of ink. We find some examples of these types of revisions where Schumann recomposed a melody from his initial sketches, corrected errors in copying, or in some cases, amended the accompaniment. The third example of revision is found in instances

---

10 Ibid., 36.
where the composer completely crossed out an entire section of music and revised it on another portion of the score, usually in a lighter shade of ink.

“Lust der Sturmnacht” (LbIII pp. 37-39)

As we learned in chapter one, “Lust der Sturmnacht” provides an example of one of Kerner’s perfectly regular texts in trochaic tetrameter. The song falls into an \textit{ABA’} musical pattern and contrasts the angst felt by the persona during the storm to the comfort provided by his beloved. On the whole, we can think of “Lust der Sturmnacht” as a song that fits into a \textit{Sturm und Drang} category, since it has an aura of unrest that Schumann accomplishes by selecting a minor key, and an accompaniment consisting of a series of unrelenting chords that alternate in both hands throughout the entire song. Set against this is a vocal line whose contour wavers between rising and falling patterns of scales.

Schumann’s original choice of E minor for this setting represents the first difference between the piano drafts and first edition, since the composer changed the tonic to E-flat minor in the latter. The original melody also reveals several changes as well. Schumann initially considered setting the first line of text by outlining a triad (E, G, B) and then repeated a B on “und.” This also applies to the parallel phrase “Schild und Fenster” and the setting of the final stanzas of “Ende nie, du” (see ex. 2.1). However, the composer crossed out this initial layer in the autograph and replaced it with what we see in example 2.2 (more than likely, at a later time since it was done in a lighter shade of ink). The latter version distinguishes the voice more clearly from the piano, since an ascending scale in the vocal part avoids the repeated Bs in the bass line of the piano. The amended opening also provides a better antecedent/consequent phrase with “Regen schauert Stürme brausen,” since it too displays conjunct motion.
Another such melodic revision occurs in the setting of the third and fourth lines of the second strophe. Schumann altered the melody from the original version on “schim-mer,” which unfolded over two C sharps as in example 2.3. He revised in the autograph, however, changing the pitch on the second syllable to A4 in a lighter shade of ink. The composer might have opted for the latter version because it connects the third and fourth lines by immediate pitch and avoids the duplication with the piano.

---

11 The following musical examples in this chapter represent my attempt to duplicate (to the best of my ability) an exact version of the layers of compositional decisions Schumann made in LbIII.
“Lust der Sturmnacht” displays an example of Schumann economizing on scrivening by using numbers to denote accompanimental repetition. For “Ende nie, du Sturmnacht,” he re-used the same music in the piano from the first two measures of example 2.2. For the next four measures, however, he merely wrote in numbers to indicate the accompanimental replication (see ex. 2.4). Schumann uses this technique quite frequently in the drafts. These particular numbers are not “keyed” to any measures earlier in the autograph: the composer most likely meant a copyist to follow the accompaniment in measures three through six for the initial stanza.

Example 2.4: repetition of accompaniment indicated by numbering

The piano postlude for “Sturmnacht” occasioned the most extensive revision made by Schumann in all of the Kerner songs. In the first autograph version of the postlude, he seems
to have envisaged initially an ascending and descending run of arpeggiated octaves in both bass and treble. He entered this in the score with the initial shade of ink, but he looks to have crossed it out in a lighter shade (see ex. 2.5a). He entered the ultimate version in a lighter shade of ink directly beneath the deleted passage (see ex. 2.5b). The re-composed postlude preserves the former’s rhythmic approach, alternating chords in both hands, but not its melodic scheme. While the first layer uses offset arpeggios to arrive at a conclusion, the latter uses chords harmonizing an ascending scale in the right hand. Although both finish on a tonic chord, Schumann preferred a more decisive cadence, where the final chords sound three times in a lower register. This differs from the first pass, where the last measure arrives at the tonic chord in a lower register and then repeats higher with open spacing.

Example 2.5a: first version of mm. 48-50 “Lust der Sturmnacht” in LbIII, p. 39

Example 2.5b: second version of mm. 48-51 “Lust der Sturmnacht” in LbIII, p. 39
“Stirb, Lieb’ und Freud’!” \textit{(L}BIII pp. 40-43\textit{)}

“Stirb, Lieb und Freud’!” constitutes one of the most dramatic of all the Kerner settings. Schumann used several archaic musical devices in order to capture the sacred content of the poem. We see this first in the use of a unique time signature: Schumann places the song in double cut time with both of the cut C symbols facing one another (see illus. 2.1). He changed this, however, in the first edition to double common time, with both symbols facing each other. He also uses a number of breves throughout the setting, and finally, much of the setting in the piano features a species-counterpoint texture.

At first, Schumann thought to place the running quarter notes that appear in the first measure in the upper stave of the piano, but he deleted the bass clef sign and entered the melody on the left-hand stave (see illus. 2.1). He might have decided upon the latter for ease of execution, since most of the notes fall in the bass register and lie in such close proximity to one another. In the bass the composer incorrectly used dotted breves for the downbeats of measures at the beginning of the song, though he initially considered a whole note tied to a half note. It also appears that he may have wanted two measures of accompanimental prelude

\begin{center}
\textit{Illustration 2.1: mm. 1-2 “Stirb, Lieb’ und Freud’!” in L}bIII, p. 40
\end{center}
as indicated by the “bis” that he wrote in a lighter shade of ink (which does not show up well in the illustration) in the middle of measure one. Instead, he opted to have the voice enter at the end of m. 1.

Some melodic alterations in the autograph of this song may give evidence of copying from a pre-existent (but no longer extant) melodic sketch. The first example of this comes with the setting of the second syllable for “Augsburg” in m. 2 (see illus. 2.1), where Schumann placed “-burg” on an E flat but changed its pitch to a G instead. Thus, the initial E flat on “-burg” might have resulted from a common third transposition in the transference of the melody from sketch to initial realization. The actual process remains unclear, though, because the parallel phrase on “Da tritt am hellen” uses the initial version.

A similar situation also appears for the setting of the words “Morgen aus,” which shows Schumann making an alteration (see ex. 2.6b). The composer changed this phrase in a lighter shade of ink when he revised the melody to parallel the same music for “hohes Haus” (compare exx. 2.6a-b; example 2.6a is how both phrases appear in the printed version). Although the melody in example 2.6b is quite unlike the former phrase, it might have been the result of a copying error since it is unlikely that Schumann would have written the second phrase so differently. Another example of disparity in parallel passages comes in the setting of “wallt” from the fourth stanza, which the composer set to the same music as in the beginning of the song. It appears that Schumann initially favored a slightly different melody on the second and third beats, unfolding over the quarter notes G and F.

In addition to the changes we find above in “Stirb Lieb’ und Freud’!,” Schumann also concerned himself with melodic transition and coherence. We find one example of this in the setting of the second repetition of “liebe Gestalt,” from the final line of the first stanza.
Initially the composer favored a different ending to this phrase altogether. Schumann changed the final three notes of “liebe” and “Gestalt” in a lighter shade (compare exx. 2.7a-b). The composer might have favored this latter version because it connects the end of this phrase with the beginning of the next by pitch.
A further example of Schumann revising for melodic coherence occurs later in the autograph of this song. For the setting of “eigen” from the last line of the second stanza he initially set the final syllable as in example 2.8. The composer altered “-gen” in a lighter shade of ink by changing it from G to quarter note on A flat. We find a second revision similar to this type in the last measure of the song, where uses breves in the bass of the piano. Initially he realized the ending as we find in example 2.9a, but he revised it (ex. 2.9b). The second layer shows that in changing the initial note in the left hand of the piano to F,
Example 2.9a: first layer of m. 71 “Stirb Lieb’ und Freud’!” in *LbIII*, p. 44

Example 2.9b: revised version of m. 71, first edition, “Stirb Lieb’ und Freud’!”

Schumann not only continues the melodic line from the previous measure on the same pitch, but also introduces a dissonance to be resolved on E, thus creating a more conjunct conclusion. The composer also decided to place the octave in the left hand on C in a lower register to produce more finality.

While melodic coherence seemed to have motivated Schumann in the previous examples, for “Stirb Lieb’ und Freud’!,” a different motivation may lie behind the revised setting of the second syllable of “arme,” which was originally cast as a half note (see ex. 2.10a). This initial realization was very similar to the rhythm of the previous measure, but Schumann altered m. 53 to the version we see in example 2.10b. This revision provides

---

Example 2.10a: first layer of mm. 52-53 “Stirb, Lieb’ und Freud’!” in *LbIII*, p. 43

Example 2.10b: second layer of mm. 52-53 “Stirb, Lieb’ und Freud’!” in *LbIII*, p. 43

dramatic variety compared to the prior measure. The composer made a parallel change for the setting of “Herz zerbricht,” which he originally cast as a half note on F for the first syllable of the last word. Schumann might have favored this solution not only for melodic and rhythmic variety (the previous measure features all three words set on half notes), but because it emphasized “Herz” and “bricht” (see ex. 2.11).
The third stanza in “Stirb” occasioned one of Schumann’s most heavily revised passages. The composer initially entered a version that corresponds more to the first edition, but he overwrote it with a melody that was completely different (compare exx. 2.12 a-b). We see this for the words “Betenden erweckt” where Schumann produced a revised melody that seems parallel to the previous measures. However, the composer rejected this change in his printed version and returned to his original conception as in ex. 2.12a. The second autograph layer involved a more independent vocal melody with a number of dotted rhythms differing from the moving bass notes in the piano.
Example 2.12b: second autograph layer of mm. 30-35 “Stirb, Lieb’ und Freud’!” in *LbIII*, pp. 41-42

For the first edition Schumann decided on a setting in which the piano and voice acted in parallel rather than contrasting entities. The composer begins as in example 2.12a, where he sets the voice to a descending G-flat scale that doubles the right hand melody in the piano. He then alters the setting of “erweckt” by re-emphasizing G flat on an offbeat in the following measure. He continues by shifting the register of the voice down and doubles the melody of the piano in the next three measures before finally arriving at “trägt,” which is sustained for the entire measure over two chromatic notes.

“Trost im Gesang” (*LbIII* pp. 44-45)

In “Trost im Gesang,” Schumann invokes the topos of traveling by involving a triumphant march for his accompaniment, with both the piano and voice set to similar dotted rhythms. The song follows an *ABAB* musical form, and the composer juxtaposes traveling (A) and singing (B) by setting the former in a declamatory style, and the latter more lyrically. The song also features a lengthier prelude and postlude than the previous realizations.

Unlike the first two songs, which feature multiple revisions by Schumann, “Trost im Gesang” exhibits few editorial changes by the composer, and we find the majority of them in the piano. All of the alterations Schumann made in the accompaniment appear in a lighter
shade of ink (including pedal markings) and deal mainly with the voicing of chords. We find examples of this in the initial stanza, where the composer added the quarter notes G and B on the third and fourth beats in the bass after considering only a half note on G for the third count. The most prevalent example of revoicing chords, however, appears in the piano interlude between the setting of the first and second stanzas. Initially, Schumann entered the version in example 2.13a. But later he opted for fuller texture in example 2.13b.

Example 2.13a: first layer of mm. 18-20, “Trost im Gesang,” in *LbIII*, p. 45

Example 2.13b: second layer of mm. 18-20, “Trost im Gesang,” in *LbIII*, p. 45

While Schumann concerned himself with chordal textures in the previous examples, he also produced other kinds of changes in the accompaniment for “Trost.” In measure 21, which begins the setting of the second stanza, the composer considered a full triad in the right hand on the first beat, but opted simply for a third with F4 and A4 natural in his second
pass. Furthermore, he initially scored the fourth beat of the same measure as F4 A4 C4 E-flat4 F4 in the right hand but decided against this chord in favor of a single F4. A similar revision to this appears in the setting of the final stanza preceding “Doch” on the second and third beats, where Schumann initially wanted the right hand to double the B4s in the bass. The composer scratches these notes out, however. Finally, Schumann initially composed the B-flat1/B-flat2 octaves in the repeat of “mir auch Licht voran” in the final stanza as whole notes but changed them to repeated half notes. He might have opted for the latter to reemphasize the dominant and provide a more decisive cadence.

The minimal alterations in the voice part in “Trost” show two different concerns, and both involve an alternate melodic motion and direction. The composer initially set “Bahn” from the second stanza as a descent from C to B-flat, but he later decided on an open fourth from C to F (compare exx. 2.14 a-b). He may have opted for the latter because it provides melodic descent to “viel,” which unfolds over D and B flat. A copying error seems to have caused the second example in setting of “auch” in m. 50 for the repeat of the last line in the fourth stanza. Schumann originally set the word on A but changed it to G. The former would have created a dissonance, and due to the fact that the piano parallels the voice here, it seems as though the composer simply transferred the melody incorrectly from his vocal sketches.

Example 2.14a: first layer of m. 25 “Trost im Gesang in LbIII, p. 45
“Wanderung” (*LbIII* pp. 46-47)

Kerner’s “Wanderung” also takes wandering as its central theme: a traveler bids farewell to his homeland with the memory of his beloved to accompany him. Schumann’s approach to the setting juxtaposes the traveler’s farewell in first three stanzas, which he sets in a lively manner with a number of uneven rhythms, to a more declamatory style for the final strophe, where he summons the beloved’s memory.

Schumann’s autograph of “Wanderung” contains several immediate and later revisions. In some areas he edited so heavily that he had to write out the letters of notes in the score rather than put them on the staff, especially for the piano. The accompaniment in m. 32 of the drafts features this procedure, and we find a further example of this also in the measure preceding the setting of the second stanza at measure twelve on “Ihr.” Here several changes forced the composer to write the letters F C and A above the bass staff for the first three chords of the measure. This passage reveals Schumann entering the right hand of the piano in the bass staff for the entire setting of the second stanza; however, he scratched out all of this and rewrote (in a lighter shade of ink) the right hand with a bass clef sign in the treble.

Schumann also made two major changes to the song after his initial draft. We find the first of these at m. 30 on the pick-up to the setting of the final stanza on “denn.” The
composer initially left the piano part to the measure blank and entered it later in a lighter shade of ink. His conclusion to “Wanderung” also shows another alteration: at first, Schumann intended the song to end in m. 46 on a B-flat chord as a dotted half note. He edited this in his second pass, however, to read as in example 2.15. It appears that Schumann wanted a more decisive cadence, and he accomplishes this by using the opening piano motive to conclude. Ending in this way not only provides more finality to the piano’s postlude, but also gives the song a sense of shape, since it provides musical rounding.

Example 2.15: mm. 46-47 “Wanderung” in LbIII, p. 48

The voice part displays several revisions demonstrating how Schumann progressed from his initial ideas to a finished product. One minor example appears at the setting of “ich” from the third line of the fourth stanza (m. 34), where Schumann initially placed the word over E-flat but crossed that note out in the same shade of ink and wrote B flat. This most likely resulted from a copying error, since the note was altered in the same shade and the next word, “fühl’s,” also occurs on an E flat. The composer later changed B flat to D in a lighter shade of ink. While the former note would have distinguished the end of the second line from the third through pitch, it appears that Schumann favored continuity between the two lines,
since the final note of “Pfand” from the conclusion of the second line of the stanza also ends on D.

We find a more puzzling example where Schumann initially set both the third syllable of “gewandert” and the word “in’s” in the first stanza (m. 4) on F but later changed the pitches to C in a different shade of ink. It seems, however, that the composer was not altogether convinced about his alternate version. Above this measure and the parallel phrase at “Erde, kein” (m. 22), the composer placed question marks over the notes he had changed. While he ultimately opted for his second layer in the printed version, he may have questioned this revision, because he favored accenting the word “gewandert” by a leap of a fourth from C to F. The change to C shows that he ultimately preferred a more conjunct line at this spot.

Schumann also deleted a repeated portion of “Wanderung.” The first layer of the autograph shows that the final line of the third stanza, “doch bin ich nicht allein” repeated to different music in m. 28 (see example 2.16a). The first version is revealing in two ways. First, it shows that Schumann initially wanted an antecedent/consequent phrase with the repeat of text and accompanying melody; this created a more direct connection between the ending of the third stanza and the beginning of the fourth. The composer deleted the first version, however, and “-lein” was changed to a dotted half note on F as noted in example 2.16b. Schumann may have done this in order to set off the fourth stanza, with its new musical marking of “Bewegter,” more distinctly.
Example 2.16a: first layer of mm. 28-30 “Wanderung” in *LbIII*, p. 47

Example 2.16b: second layer of mm. 28-30 “Wanderung” in *LbIII*, p. 47

The setting of the voice at the beginning of the final stanza shows another change from Schumann’s initial pass. The composer originally had “denn ach! auf” and its parallel phrase in m. 33 unfold over three consecutive B flats (see example 2.17a). He altered this in a lighter shade to the version we find in example 2.17b. The composer might have opted for the latter version for a number of reasons. First, he may have found his initial melody too repetitious, since B flat is repeated four times before the melody moved on. This would have been true also for the optional melody in example 2.17a. The change to a rising arpeggio

---

13 It must be noted that the accompaniment in measures 28 and 29 were not notated as my example shows: rather, Schumann wrote in the numbers eight and nine that reference the accompaniment from measures ten and eleven to be played here.
seems not only to provide more variety for both passages, but it also serves the emphatic nature of Kerner’s text more expressively.

Example 2.17a: first layer of mm. 30-31 “Wanderung” in LbIII, p. 47

Example 2.17b: revised layer of mm. 30-31 “Wanderung” in LbIII, p. 47

“Auf das Trinkglas eines verstorbenen Freundes” (LbIII pp. 48–49)

Schumann’ realization of “Auf das Trinkglas” offers a prime example of why the autograph of the Kerner songs could not have served as an engraver’s exemplar. The composer produced numerous revisions of both piano and vocal parts throughout the setting that would obscure a clear version of what he intended for anybody proceeding from the autograph alone, despite the song’s distinct ABA’C musical pattern.
Schumann employed various abbreviated means in order to save time in notating the accompaniment. He indicated octave doubling by writing “8va” underneath, for example beginning on the second beat of m. 3 and continuing through m. 4. He also abbreviated the piano part by using letters to indicate repeats, for instance marking the accompaniment two measures before “Still geht der” with an “a” and then placing that letter in the middle of the piano staves with nothing else. He did this again in consecutive measures by labeling the piano part at “Erst tönt die” (b) and “mitternächt-ge” (c) and then entered the respective letters in the accompaniment for the two following measures. Finally, Schumann used a transverse line through two blank measures of the piano at “nach in dem krystall’nen” to indicate a repeat of the immediately preceding accompaniment.

Most of the revisions for the piano in “Auf das Trinkglas” concern the voicing of chords. In most cases, Schumann initially preferred fuller chordal textures for the piano but opted for a reduced amount of doubling when he revised. We find an example of this on the fourth beat in the bass of the piano in m. 11, where the composer scored F2 A2 D3 and A2 D3 F3 initially, and later deleted A2 from both. A similar example also appears in m. 14, where the first three chords in the left hand initially had additional notes as well as the second and third chords in the right hand. But Schumann opted for open fifths in the left hand and removed F4s from the right hand chords (these notes seem to be a mistake on his part) as we see by comparing examples 2.18a-b. This also makes the suspension in the inner voices clearer and changes the harmony.
The composer also opted for less doubling in his revision of the final chords in the piano’s postlude. Initially, he favored the final cadence as it appears in example 2.19. However, Schumann crossed out the first chord in the right hand but left an octave in the bass for the first beat, and he also deleted the upper B flat and E flat in the right hand for the next two chords. While both versions show a preference for closed spacing of the tonic chords, the final version displays less doubling once again.
Example 2.19: first layer of mm. 55-56 “Auf das Trinkglas” in *LbIII*, p. 50

Two revisions Schumann undertook for the accompaniment in the drafts concern octaves. For the second syllable of “deinem” through “theuren Blute,” Schumann initially placed both hands one octave higher. However, he decided to move both hands down (compare exx. 2.20a-b). The second instance of octave transposition is found in bass of the accompaniment for “nicht Gewöhnlichen zu” and its parallel phrase at “nichts den Freund vom Freund kann,” where the composer initially scored the left hand as octaves (see ex. 2.21). However, he decided to delete the bottommost notes in the left hand beginning on the double B flat at “Gewöhn-”.

Example 2.20a: initial layer of mm. 35-36 “Auf das Trinkglas” in *LbIII*, p. 49
Revisions to the voice part in “Auf das Trinkglas” often parallel each other. The composer initially set the word “in” on F natural in m. 17 (see example 2.22). But he appears to have changed his mind immediately, and he decided to keep “in” and the accompaniment on G flat. He made a similar change in the parallel phrase, “Doch wird mir klar zu,” where “zu” was set on B flat but was changed to C flat. It appears that Schumann initially favored an anticipation of the following measure. In the end, however, he decided for a version that created more movement over the barline.
Example 2.22: initial layer of mm. 17-18 “Auf das Trinkglas” in LbIII, p. 49

Schumann’s initial pass through “Auf das Trinkglas” also shows two examples of discrepancies between parallel phrases. For the setting of “Glas so hold!,” Schumann originally set “so hold” so as to avoid paralleling “stehst du leer” from m. 3 (see example 2.23). He changed his mind, however, and reverted back to the parallel setting in the autograph.

Example 2.23: initial version of m. 26 “Auf das Trinkglas” in LbIII, p. 49

Three areas of the song show several revisions that might have come by way of copying mistakes. The first appears at “Sterne Gold, Pokal,,” where the composer initially placed “Gold” on an A flat quarter note and “Po-” unfolded over a G, as noted in example 2.24a. This probably resulted from Schumann entering over a page: the first two beats of m. 34 appear on the bottom of page 49 and the rest of it continues at the top of page 50. The
composer corrected his mistake (including the rhythm at “Gold”) in a lighter shade of ink, as we see in example 2.24b.

Example 2.24a: first version of m. 26 “Auf das Trinkglas” in LbIII, p. 49-50

Example 2.24b: revised version of m. 26 “Auf das Trinkglas” in LbIII, p. 49-50

Another copying error appears following the setting of “mitternäch’t-ge” at m. 40 where an extra measure appears. It seems as though the composer accidentally re-entered the text setting and words for “-nächt –ge,” realized his error by crossing it out, and entered the ensuing “Stunde” in the next measure. The next example could have a number of causes. Beginning with “der heil’ge Klang,” Schumann’s realization becomes quite muddled (see Illustration 2.2). The first item that catches our eye in the autograph is the setting that Schumann crossed out. Due to the fact that the two melodies appear in the same shade of ink, did Schumann envisage an optional melody at this point? This notion seems unlikely: the
It appears that he also miscopied text in the measures in the voice where the transverse line is drawn, where Schumann erred in copying “dem krystall’nen” and “dem” originally appeared in consecutive measures.

Illustration 2.2: mm. 49-55 “Auf das Trinkglas” in LbIII, p. 49

To say the least, the remaining portions of illustration 2.2 are very ambiguous and look to be the result of both copying errors and second-guessing by Schumann. For the voice in the first measure with the transverse line, one possibility may have been that he wanted the melody to unfold over half notes on B flat, which would have created a parallel phrase to “der heil’ge” in m. 47. However, he changed his mind and looks to have set only “dem” on a half note. He then repeated the word (mistakenly) over quarters in the next measure. Once he realized his error, he produced the final version underneath to include “kry-”. Schumann also had a different version for the setting of “Grunde” since it originally unfolded as an F whole note (tied to another F whole note) which he then changed to a B flat whole note. The final version in the autograph, however, shows that he favored a more conjunct approach since he settled on a C whole note.

“Stille Liebe” (LbIII pp. 51-52)

As we saw in the previous chapter, “Stille Liebe” presents an ironic conceit, revealed in the final strophe, of a persona who has fashioned a song about not being able to sing for his
beloved. Schumann’s setting is strophic for the first two stanzas; however, the inability to
sing in the final strophe elicits an ironically florid accompaniment of arpeggiated quintuplets
that leaves the impression that the speaker actually can perform.

Unlike the previous setting, “Stille Liebe” contains very few revisions by the
composer, and the majority of these changes concern voicing of chords in the piano. We find
an example of this in m. 17 of the drafts, where Schumann initially considered adding a C
flat to the G flat octave of the piano. We find a more detailed example of this type in mm. 45-
48 of the piano postlude, where Schumann initially considered the version in example 2.25a.
Ultimately, he opted for a somewhat different chord progression in the right hand, as we see
example 2.25b.

Example 2.25a: first version of mm. 45-48 “Stille Liebe” in LbIII, p. 52

Example 2.25b: second version of mm. 45-48 “Stille Liebe” in LbIII, p. 52
The voice part of “Stille Liebe” shows few alterations by Schumann. We find one in the setting of “Lied” in m. 11, where Schumann initially placed the word over eighth notes on C and B flat. The composer changed this to a B flat quarter note for “Lied,” however. He might have altered this for reasons of consistency: the two parallel phrases following this are also set on a single note rather than a melisma (see example 2.26).

![Example 2.26: first layer of m. 11 “Stille Liebe” in LbIII, p. 51](image)

“Stille Thränen” (*LbIII* pp. 53-55)

Although “Stille Thränen” is one of Kerner’s shorter poems (only three stanzas), the setting is one of Schumann’s longest. In addition, it represents one of the more harmonically complex Kerner songs, receiving a highly chromatic treatment. We see this at the start of almost every vocal entry, where Schumann often begins with some sort of chromatic half step. Furthermore, the range of the voice is wide (G4 to B flat5), and the majority of the setting lies in an upper register.

Employing a similar method to that in “Auf das Trinkglas,” Schumann uses abbreviations in the accompaniment to save time in scrivening. For the most of the piano part the composer entered in only the first chord on the downbeat of a measure and then a shorthand of dots to indicate accompanimental repetition (an instance of this appears in
example 2.29a below). In addition, he also used a transverse line (with dots on both sides) to indicate the repeat of pedal tones in the bass of the piano.

The piano part offers very little in the way of revision, but one measure appears in a completely different version from the first edition. Measure 70 of the autograph features a piano part that appears in example 2.27a, but it was altered in the first edition (see ex. 2.27b). It is difficult to say why Schumann rethought this. Although the second version is more stable in its harmonic approach (perhaps the reason the composer ultimately chose it), the former seems more creative. The top notes of the right hand offer a descending melodic line that begins on F and continues downward to the tonic in the next measure. This would have emphasized both the arrival on the tonic and the forte dynamic marking indicated by the composer.

Example 2.27a: m. 70 “Stille Thränen” in LbIII, p. 55

Example 2.27b: first edition, m. 70, “Stille Thränen”
The voice part shows more by way of reconsideration. We find one example in the setting of “wunderblau,” where the composer initially entered the last two eighth notes on a descending fourth from C to G as shown in example 2.28a. He changed his mind, however, favoring a more conjunct approach that features a continuation of the D from “wun-” for the next eighth note and descends to C on “-der” for the second. This also connected the final syllable of the word by pitch, as shown in example 2.28b. Schumann follows a similar course for the first syllable of “geschlummert,” which he initially set on B flat but changed it to C, matching the same note for the second syllable. We find another instance of this at “dann ihr meinet,” where Schumann initially considered a continuation of E natural from “dann” to “ihr,” but he lowered the latter’s setting down a third to C. Instead of favoring conjunct motion, Schumann opts here for a leap, which not only provides melodic variance from “dann” to “ihr,” but also changes the melodic ambitus to a wider interval.

We find four different instances of altered rhythmic declamation in this song, all concerning uneven note values. The first of these appears in m. 33, where Schumann

![Example 2.28a: first layer of mm. 16-18 “Stille Thränen” in LbIII, p. 56](image-url)
Example 2.28b: revised version of mm. 16-18 “Stille Thränen” in *LbIII*, p. 56

originally distributed the first two syllables of “niedergoss” as we see in example 2.29a. The composer changed his mind, however, and altered the declamation to the version found in example 2.29b.

Example 2.29a: first version of m. 34 “Stille Thränen” in *LbIII*, p. 54

Example 2.29b: revised layer of m. 34 “Stille Thränen” in *LbIII*, p. 54
While the first version shows the syllables distributed equally in this measure, earlier parallel phrases follow the revised pattern. The revision in example 2.29b, then, not only shows a preference for consistency, it also produces a more distinctive declamation.

Similarly, Schumann first set “sei sein” to a different rhythm from its parallel phrase in m. 32 ("niedergoss") by altering the pitches on “sei,” and favored a different rhythmic anticipation for the next measure by placing “sein” on a quarter note (see example 2.30a). His revision shows that he adjusted the similar rhythms and melodic intervals to read as we find them in example 2.30b. This again brings two parallel passages into agreement. This same pattern of

Example 2.30a: first version of m. 49 “Stille Thränen” in LbIII, p. 54

Example 2.30b: m. 49 “Stille Thränen” in LbIII, p. 54

revision also surfaces in m. 61. For the repeat of the last line from the poem, “stets fröhlich sey sein Herz,” Schumann’s original read as we find it in example 2.31a. The composer in his second pass altered the rhythm in a lighter shade of ink, and he also changed the setting of the first syllable for “fröhlich” to a D, as we see in example 2.31b.
“Frage” \textit{(LbIII p. 56)}

Schumann’s setting of “Frage” reflects the fact that Kerner’s text consists of a single stanza. The result is a song framed on a rather small scale (sixteen measures), in which the composer connects all of the lines from the poem, and in which both piano and voice run continuously from start to finish.

Schumann altered very little from his initial draft for “Frage.” However, we find for the setting of “fullte noch in” (see example 2.32a) he might have erred in the initial voice part for his sketches. He seems to have miscounted the correct number of beats in the measure by a dotted sixteenth note, and he attempted to correct this by changing “noch” from an eighth to a quarter note. This, however, produced too many beats. He finally achieved the correct
value for this measure in the first edition (and he corrected the piano part correspondingly)
where the second syllable of “füllte” was changed to a thirty-second note as noted in example
2.32b.

Example 2.32a: m. 14 “Frage” in LbIII, p. 53

Example 2.32b: first edition, m. 14, “Frage”

We find the only other revision Schumann made in “Frage” at “arger,” where it looks
as though the composer wanted a half note on C in the left hand of the piano in the
penultimate measure (see example 2.33). He deleted this note immediately, however, in the
same shade of ink as the initial layer, leaving the octave on an A half note with an E quarter
note. Schumann may have altered his initial version partly because the open spacing of the
chord would have produced difficulty in execution, and because the C in the left hand of the
piano doubles the right hand and produced a more pronounced dissonance with the B natural
anticipation.
Example 2.33: first layer of m. 15-16 “Frage” in LbIII, p. 53

“Wer machte dich so krank?” (LbIII p. 57)

In the autograph of “Wer machte dich so krank?,” Schumann designated for the first time a particular voice by writing “für Bariton” beneath the title in parenthesis. The song follows an ABA’ musical pattern and like “Frage” it stands as one of the shorter songs among the Kerner settings.

The composer made two mistakes in his first pass at a complete version for the realization. He initially entered the rhythm in the third measure incorrectly by adding an extra half beat in the voice part (see ex. 2.34). The first edition shows a correct version in which “krank” was changed to a quarter tied to a sixteenth note. Schumann also copied text incorrectly for the second line of the second strophe, where it looks as though he accidentally entered the last line of the first strophe, “und keine Sternennacht,” in its place. He later corrected this in a lighter shade of ink after his second pass.

While the accompaniment is fairly straightforward for “Wer machte,” there are some instances where Schumann revised. One such change comes in the penultimate measure, where the composer initially prepared the final measure by repeating the G octave on the
Example 2.34: mm. 1-4 “Wer machte dich so krank?” in *LbIII*, p. 57

sixth beat as an eighth note as we see in example 2.35. However, he scratched this out and changed the preceding octave on G to a dotted quarter note to parallel the chord in the right hand.

Example 2.35: first layer of mm. 26 “Wer machte dich so krank?” in *LbIII*, p. 57

Another instance of revision for the piano part occurs in m. 18, where “Thals” originally received a different harmonization that carried over to “Daß” in the next measure as we find in example 2.36a. Schumann changed this approach (in a lighter shade of ink in his second pass) for both measures as we see in example 2.36b. Although he initially placed the B flat D flat G chord on the third beat of measure the composer decided to make it serve as a pick-up chord. The next measure shows another revision. Although the downbeat on “Daß” stood as an A flat chord in root position, followed by a third on E flat G in the left
hand, Schumann changed the initial third on the first beat to C E flat (where C is the root) and deleted E flat on the fourth beat, leaving only G. In the former instance, it appears that Schumann favored parallel motion in both hands, rather than contrary, leading to the downbeat in m. 19. For the melody of “Thals” Schumann changed his initial version to unfold over G instead and altered the piano’s rhythm. The latter change limits the dissonance of the passing tones in the right hand to a shorter duration and on a weak beat (compare exx. 2.36a-b).

Example 2.36a: first layer of mm. 18-19 “Wer machte dich so krank?” in LbIII, p. 57

Example 2.36b: later revision of mm. 18-19 “Wer machte dich so krank?” in LbIII, p. 57

Two other revisions Schumann made for the voice part show a preference for melodic continuity. For the initial setting of “Schlummern” in the second stanza, the composer first chose a falling third (see example 2.37). He later changed the second syllable of “Schlummern” to remain on the same note as the previous syllable. Schumann also made a
similar change for the second syllable of “Blüthenbett,” which initially unfolded as eighth notes B flat and G, but was changed to remain on B flat for both syllables.

Example 2.37: m. 15 “Wer machte dich so krank?” in LbIII, p. 57

The initial setting of the third line from the final strophe offers another example of melodic continuity. The first version of mm. 22-24 appears in example 2.38a. Schumann altered this greatly in his second pass to the reading we find in example 2.38b. The former version features melodic disjunction in its leap up of a fourth to declame “Natur,” and a descending melodic line to the third syllable of “gesunden.” But in the end Schumann opted not only for a more conjunct approach that ascends to B flat, but also a more a decisive phrase that stresses “mich” on A natural. This seems to provide a more definitive antecedent phrase to the consequent at “sie lassen mich nicht ruh’n,” which also displays a rising conjunct line to the A flat for “ruh’n.”
Example 2.38a: initial layer for mm. 22-23 “Wer machte dich so krank?” in *LbIII*, p. 57

Example 2.38b: revised version of mm. 22-23 “Wer machte dich so krank?” in *LbIII*, p. 57

“Alte Laute” (*LbIII* p. 58)

Schumann writes “Dieselbe Weise” above the title of “Alte Laute” and employs much of the same accompaniment as for “Wer machte dich so krank?” But Schumann begins with a different prelude in the piano which appears in example 2.39. After this point, the composer did not enter any accompaniment for “Alte Laute” until m. 24, where both melody and accompaniment change somewhat (see ex. 2.40). While both songs end in a similar way, the composer doubles the voice at “bangen” in the right hand, which he did not do in the corresponding phrase for the previous song. The melodies and accompaniment for the last three syllables also differ. In “Wer machte dich so krank?” the voice ascends to A flat on the final note by stepwise motion, and in the latter, through an open fourth that descends by step to the tonic.
Example 2.39: mm. 1-4 “Alte Laute” in *LbIII*, p. 58

Example 2.40: mm. 24-26 “Alte Laute” in *LbIII*, p. 58

“Sehnsucht nach der Waldgegend” (*LbIII* pp. 59-60)

Schumann produced a major change in the autograph for “Sehnsucht nach der Waldgegend” in the opening prelude for the piano. He first considered a measure of introduction as it appears in example 2.44. However, the composer crossed this out in a lighter shade of ink, and he proceeded in a completely different manner in subsequent measures. While the previous example shows that Schumann at first favored a chordal opening, the next version shows an arpeggiated accompaniment without any prelude (see ex. 2.42). The original prelude would have immediately set the stage for the chromatic movement throughout the rest of the setting with a sequence of descending chords in the left hand of the piano.
Juxtaposed to the lyrically descending scale in the right hand, this would have made for an appealing precursor to the way in which the rest of the song unfolds. Had Schumann kept the omitted prelude, moreover, he would have created a point of reference for framing the song as a whole. We find the deleted prelude resurfacing as a brief interlude between strophes (see ex. 2.43) and it also appears that the composer wished to use this material as an interlude before the setting of the final stanza. That too was deleted, however, and he proceeded with the arpeggiated pattern instead. Schumann may have decided against his initial prelude because he felt its chordal approach ran contrary to the rest of the arpeggiated setting for the accompaniment. The composer might also have wanted to place an immediate emphasis on the voice without any introduction, in order to establish its lamenting tone more directly.
In addition to the parts Schumann decided to omit from the score, he revised several portions of “Sehnsucht nach der Waldgegend.” The voice, in particular, shows several changes, the first of which appears in the setting of “wunderbar,” where Schumann initially composed the melody as we find it in example 2.44a. He changed this, however, in both its rhythm and melody to read as it does in example 2.44b. The composer might have opted for the latter version to establish a stronger arrival on B flat at “-bar” by approaching it from the leading tone. Schumann opted for conjunct motion, however, in both piano and voice parts at “Busen frisch und hell.” He initially set “Hell” on a G half note, which doubled the G in the
Example 2.44b: revision of m. 4 “Sehnsucht nach der Waldgegend” in *LbIII*, p. 59

E flat, G, C chord in the right hand of the piano (see example 2.45). The composer, however, changed the setting for “hell” to a C half note and also removed the G in the right hand of the piano.

Example 2.45: first layer of m. 11 “Sehnsucht nach der Waldgegend” in *LbIII*, p. 60

The portion of the song that received the most revisions occurs in the last two lines of the second stanza. The initial layer of realization unfolded as we see it in example 2.46a. After this point, the accompaniment proceeded like the omitted measure of introduction we saw in example 2.41. Schumann had decided to delete that measure by this point, and he re-composed measures 18-19. First he revised the voice part as we see it in example 2.46b. Then he changed the accompaniment entirely, entering it at the bottom of the score (example 2.47) and ledged it into the text with the letters “a” and “b.” The composer most likely
altered the vocal part to anticipate a different cadence at “um.” The melody of the latter version shows that Schumann inverted parts of the vocal setting: instead of rising thirds on “schau’,” “Lüften” and “Wolken,” he altered the line to descending thirds for the first two words and a falling second for the latter. This lowered the general tessitura, and it also created a more conjunct approach to “Wolkenbildern um” that resolves on A rather than D, connecting to the start of the fourth stanza more directly. The changes to the accompaniment not only accommodate the re-composed vocal part, but also provide a different transition to the start of the final stanza. In this instance, the approach is not arpeggiated whatsoever and quite brief, since only a half-measure preceded the setting of the fourth stanza.

Example 2.46a: first version of mm. 18-19 “Sehnsucht nach der Waldgegend” in *LbIII* p. 60

Example 2.46b: second layer of m. 18-19 “Sehnsucht nach der Waldgegend” in *LbIII* p. 60

14 Measure nineteen appears as best as I can reproduce it. The rhythm of the voice does not have enough beats. Some of the difficulties in transcribing this measure include the fact that Schumann did not align the vocal part with the accompaniment, and because his second version is so much different than the first, knowing what he initially envisaged is not immediately apparent.
Example 2.47: insertion for mm. 18-19 “Sehnsucht nach der Waldgegend” in *LbIII* p. 60

“Erstes Grün” (*LbIII* p. 61)

Schumann presents “Erstes Grün” strophically in the autograph, with each verse written underneath the other (the second and third verses were added in a different shade of ink). He placed an instruction in the right hand margin indicating moreover that he wanted the song engraved in full: “das zweite (u.) dritte Verse auszusteichen,” an instruction obviously meant for a third party (more about this later in the content of “Wanderlied”). Initially, Schumann seems to have considered writing out the first verse and then pairing the second under third separately, but he then changed his mind to save time in composing. A strophic printing of

Illustration 2.3: m. 4-5 “Erstes Grün” in *LbIII*, p. 61
the song might not have been desirable, however, since the third verse is slightly different from the previous two (see the downward direction of stems for the third verse as in illustration 2.3).

Only minor variants exist in the realization of “Erstes Grün,” and all concern doubled notes in the accompaniment. Schumann had full triads beginning in the second measure with the addition of a D atop the final sixteenth notes, and m. 3 contained D, B, and G, respectively, on the first three sixteenth notes (as noted in example 2.48a). But the composer altered this version by scratching out several notes in a lighter shade of ink to read as the version we find in example 2.48b. Schumann also omitted the bottommost notes for all of the chords in the right hand in measure five as seen in illustration 2.3.

Example 2.48a: first layer of mm. 2-3 “Erstes Grün” in LbIII, p. 61

Example 2.48b: revised version of mm. 2-3 “Erstes Grün” in LbIII, p. 61

“Sängers Trost” (LbIII pp. 61-62)
Schumann’s initial pass through “Sängers Trost” is unexceptional in that it shows little variance from the printed version. But he did make a handful of notations worth considering. Schumann used numbers to indicate accompanimental repetition in measures ten through seventeen, without keying the numbers to previous measures. We can assume that since the first two stanzas receive the same setting, the composer was referring to the accompaniment in measures two through nine.

Although the third stanza receives a similar setting to the previous two, Schumann started writing the accompaniment again where it begins at measure eighteen. He may have done this because he changes the melody somewhat. A slight variance in the rhythm of the voice occurs twice (the first at m. 20 for “bald” and the other in m. 24 at “und”), and in both instances, he uses an eighth rest to displace the downbeat of the measure. By displacing the beginning of each line by a half beat, Schumann increases the emotional affect, reflecting the tempo marking above the third stanza (“nach und nach bewegter”).

This culminates in the setting of the last stanza with a different setting for the voice that rises considerably in pitch. He accomplishes this by raising the tessitura of the voice to a higher register and providing alternate notes as well. Perhaps Schumann was sensitive to the poetic conceit found in the final stanza, where the persona pays homage to himself and nature. Thus, a more lyrical style fits this portion of the text.

“Wanderlied” (*LbIII* pp. 63-64)

The final Kerner setting in *LbIII* is the drinking song “Wanderlied,” which was entered similarly to “Erstes Grün,” with the first two stanzas of text above one another. We find, moreover, a similar instruction to that for the earlier song, one of particular importance: beneath the third stanza at “Vogel” Schumann wrote “auszuschreiben,” to be written out.
This note (and also the one Schumann provided for “Erstes Grün) offers a very important clue for us. As we have seen, the state of the songs in LbIII would have made it very difficult for this autograph to serve as the engraver’s exemplar, due to the many revisions. Producing an edition from it, therefore, would have been almost impossible. This instruction appears to be meant for a copyist who was to prepare a fair copy of the cycle to serve as the engraving exemplar. Because the composer would have no need for such an instruction had he prepared the fair copy, we have discovered not only the mechanism by which Schumann transmitted his text for printing, but we can also deduce with some certainty the existence of a fair copy (now lost) in which the composer may have entered further corrections for printing and arrived at the final order of the cycle.

Two features of the realization for “Wanderlied” are unique. Schumann used a different technique to save time in composing the setting of the final verse, where he chose to repeat the first stanza. After the repetition of “Wohlauf nach getrunken den,” he places a marginal instruction indicating that the same five measures in the accompaniment from this point in the initial stanza repeat. He then begins with new music for “Es treibt in die Ferne mich.” Schumann also stopped writing in the last half of m. 53 and left it incomplete as we see in example 2.49.

Example 2.50 shows that he completed this later in a lighter shade of ink beneath the measures he had begun. Although we might pose a number of explanations as to why he composed this portion later, perhaps he was simply unsure initially how he wanted to conclude. The place at which he stopped composing features the repeat of the descend
Example 2.49: mm. 52-53 “Wanderlied” in LbIII p. 65

ing chord sequence from m. 51; the latter version appears to continue the sequence again in
the second half of the measure and repeats it yet again as both hands shift to the bass and
finally resolves to the tonic.

Example 2.50: mm. 53-56 “Wanderlied” in LbIII p. 65

Schumann produced two revisions in “Wanderlied” that involve doubling chords. We
find an example in the first four chords of the right hand at the second entry of “ferneste
Land,” where the composer initially scored more heavily (see in example 2.51). He later
revised this to delete G, F, D, and D from each respective chord in the right hand. We find
another example after the setting of both the first and second stanzas, where Schumann
initially used a fuller texture (see in example 2.52a) and later revised this to read as we see in
example 2.52b. The rhythm in the accompaniment for m. 12 also changed. In the former
example, Schumann initially wanted the piano to mirror the rhythm of the preceding melodic line. However, he decided against this and opted for separated eighth notes. The result is a cadence that is not only rhythmically different from voice, but also melodically.

Example 2.51: m. 35 “Wanderlied” in *LbIII*, p. 64

Example 2.52a: mm. 11-12 “Wanderlied” in *LbIII*, p. 63

Example 2.52b: mm. 11-12 “Wanderlied” in *Lb III*, p. 63
The first entry of “ferneste Land,” in “Wanderlied” shows a slightly different concern. The composer first entered a stepwise approach for the setting of “ferneste,” but he later decided against this, opting for a leap of a fourth in the melody to D flat that descended stepwise to B flat (compare exx. 2.53a-b). It appears that Schumann wanted to highlight “ferneste” making the concept of distance more poignant.

![Example 2.53a: first layer of m. 35 “Wanderlied” in LbIII p. 65](image1)

![Example 2.53b: revised version of m. 48 “Wanderlied” in LbIII p. 65](image2)

**Varieties of Compositional Revisions in Summary**

The realizations of the fourteen Kerner songs in *LbIII* display several types of compositional procedures that Schumann used to produce drafts and five main types of musical details that concerned the composer. Compositional procedures include matters of exact repetition and transfer of the vocal line from the lost melodic sketches to manuscript (*LbIII*) in which he initially entered his first drafts (the latter sometimes required fixing). More significant
compositional elements that occasioned revision included Schumann’s concern for melodic expressivity that highlighted aspects of Kerner’s verse, consistency and continuity of vocal lines, piano texture, and also the consistency of accompanimental textures. Although it is unfortunate that there are no extant sketches for the songs, we can still determine some details of Schumann’s initial conception as he transferred them from a preliminary stage into full realizations with piano accompaniment. And although Hallmark’s assertion that the songs in the Berlin autograph correspond “to the category of complete draft,” they certainly were not final ones since the composer continued to revise between these drafts and the first edition.

Schumann realized his songs with alacrity, and we find him using repeat signs, letter or number cues, and other types of shorthand methods to avoid rewriting passages. He further accomplished this with the use of a transverse line as in “Auf das Trinkglas eines verstorbenen Freun des,” by writing “Dieselbe Weise” for “Alte Laute,” using a shorthand of dots in “Stille Thränen,” and indicating “Auszuschreiben” for “Wanderlied.” A final example is found in “Erstes Grün,” where the composer wrote each of the verse underneath one another but placed an instruction in the margin to write out the second and third verses. While some of these mechanisms were used to save time in notating, others were used as instructions to serve a scribe who would eventually prepare the fair copy.

Although Schumann employed shortcuts in transferring the songs from sketches, one of the striking qualities of these drafts is the detail with which he worked in editing them. Almost every song possesses a few revisions to both piano and voice, although some more than others. And the changes the composer made show a variety of possibilities. These drafts may have served as a way for the composer to correct mistakes he made in copying them.
from his initial sketches. As my analysis has shown, Schumann might have made errors in copying by placing a note on an incorrect line or space, or by making a common transposing error of a fourth or fifth in the vocal part. Some of the errors even had to do with simply miscounting the number of beats in a measure, as with "Frage" and "Wer machte dich so krank?." As we discovered, some of these corrections were made immediately and in the same shade of ink, while others were amended in a different shade and at a later time.

While noting his missteps along the way shows one way in which he revised the songs, they do not reveal much about his decisions in composing. We find even more compelling rethinking by Schumann in the portions of the manuscript where he opted for something completely different from his initial pass. More often than not, the composer produced such revisions at a later time, marking over his first version in a lighter shade of ink. For songs such as "Wanderung," Schumann revised not only for melodic variation in the voice, but also to serve the more expressive aspects of Kerner’s poetry. "Stille Thränen" shows changes that were in favor of more conjunct vocal lines and a preference for consistency in melodic phrases. In "Auf das Trinkglas eines verstorbenen Freundes," we found that Schumann’s revisions were mainly concerned with piano textures, specifically doubling in chords. In essence, these changes not only allow us to view the compositional process of the composer and the ways he edited his sketches in full realization, but also to offer conjecture as to why Schumann might have made these specific changes.

One particular revision by Schumann stands apart from the catalogue above. For "Stirb, Lieb’und Freud’!" (mm. 30-31), the composer revised his initial pass with a completely different melody. However, he reverted back to his first layer in the printed edition. Although the vast majority of the composer’s second layers became his "last word,"
this example shows a different level of consideration: a revision that was rejected in favor of his first inspiration. More importantly, it shows he continued to rethink his revisions in a stage that followed the piano realizations.

Perhaps the most revealing facet of the piano drafts comes in the form of phrases that Schumann completely crossed out and then re-composed on other portions of the score. These revisions, such as the one for the postlude of “Lust der Sturmnacht,” often show completely different versions from the original. For “Lust der Sturmnacht,” we found that Schumann preferred a more decisive conclusion in his second version. While we found reasons why Schumann opted to re-compose this postlude, his decision against the piano prelude for “Sehnsucht nach der Waldgegend” was not as apparent. Although the prelude that the composer decided against would have established a context for the song’s use of chromatics and material for interludes between strophes, Schumann’s final decision to leave out the chordal opening may have resulted from a desire for consistency, since most of the song is arpeggiated.

In all, the state of the piano drafts at this point seem to serve as a basis for which a fair copy would be prepared at a later time. As we shall see in the next chapter, Schumann would continue to re-think his Kerner settings, as he shaped a cycle from their narrative possibility, tonal arrangement, and changed their overall number for what would eventually result in the first edition print.
Chapter III: The Creation of the Kerner Liederreihe and Publication of the First Edition

Although Schumann made references in his diary on two separate occasions to his 1840 Kerner songs as a cyclic entity, we find no readily apparent teleological narrative for the songs in the initial chronology of sketches and realizations in *LbIII*. While we explored what Schumann might have had in mind in terms of a narrative as he selected Kerner’s verse in Chapter 1, the order of the realizations suggests a new appraisal of the poetry, during which the composer might have begun to consider different organizational schemes. As we saw in Chapter 2, he appears to have entered most of the realizations of the songs according to general key areas rather than with a narrative scheme in mind, but both narrative and music intersected as he prepared the first edition for publication.

Because Schumann did not use the realizations of the Kerner songs in *LbIII* for engraving (due to the vast number of corrections and variants), it was necessary to produce a fair copy from which an engraver could prepare plates. Although no such manuscript appears to have survived, it seems likely from the autograph Schumann made appropriate corrections for the songs in fair copy and could also have requested changes in the plates. There are extant manuscripts of this type for other cycles, such as *Frauenliebe und Leben*, op. 42, in a copyist’s hand with penciled corrections by the composer.¹ Although we cannot know the exact details of the work Schumann put into the fair copy for op. 35 or any last minute decisions he made during the engraving of the final version, we can still note organizational

differences between the autograph stage and the first edition print. We must then triangulate between these two points to construct a hypothetical process by which Schumann may have arrived at the ordering of songs in op. 35, just as we have deduced the process of composition by comparing the two sources.

Publication History

After Schumann completed the Kerner songs in December 1840, a relatively long period of time passed before the first edition of op. 35 was published by C.A. Klemm of Leipzig in May 1841. Regrettably, we cannot establish the full details of Schumann’s various communications (written or verbal) with Klemm. Nonetheless, some accounts of their collaboration are known: Schumann’s first documented contact with Klemm came near the end of 1840 (December 29), when the composer informed the publisher that he would send the Kerner songs in eight to fourteen days. Even though this suggests that Klemm had already agreed to publish Schumann’s Lieder, apparently, they had not settled on a price and the composer had not yet finalized the content (especially since the final song, “Wanderlied,” was composed on the same day as their first documented contact). On 24 April 1841, Klemm sent Schumann the conditions of the contract, which included an honorarium of 54 thalers, and an agreement for the pre-release of “Stille Thränen” to serve as an advertisement for the entire cycle in the Sammlung von Musikstücken alter und neuer Zeit, a supplement to the NZfM. This early release appeared in the supplement from 7 May 1841 and it alluded to the

---

2 Margit McCorkle, Robert Schumann. Thematisch-Bibliographisches Werkverzeichnis (Mainz, 2003), 146. The source McCorkle uses for this passage comes from Schumann’s Briefverzeichnis, Robert-Schumann-Haus, Zwickau, entry no. 737.

3 Ibid. The composer also documents this honorarium in Tb III, 671. The actual entry Schumann made was “Von Klemm in L[eipz][ig] Bar f. Op. 35” on 24 April 1841.
forthcoming songs “From the greater song collection op. 35, which is to appear from C. A. Klemm.” In addition to this, Klemm also placed an advertisement for op. 35 that appeared in the *Blätter für Musik und Literatur* on 19 May 1841.

The cover page for the first edition of op. 35 presented the songs as *Zwölf Gedichte von Justinus Kerner, Eine Liederreihe für eine Singstimme mit Begleitung des Pianoforte*. The songs appeared in two separate volumes, with the elaborate cover page seen in illustration 3.1. The second volume received an identical cover, with the only exception being its designation as *Heft II*. Although there is no record in the correspondence between Klemm and Schumann, either one might have chosen the iconography of the cover, with its lyre at the top of the page and various floral motifs, as particularly appropriate to a cycle featuring rustic or musical references in so many numbers.

The dedicatee of op. 35 was Dr. Friedrich Weber (1808-1886) of London. Gerd Nauhaus relates that Weber was the son of a Norwegian-Swedish consulate in Triest. Before he became a physician in 1837, both he and Schumann were classmates in Heidelberg during the time in which the composer was pursuing a law degree (1829-30). Furthermore, Weber was temporarily engaged to the soprano Clara Novello (1818-1908), who became a well-known concert singer (specifically for her performance of oratorios) throughout Europe, and she was the daughter of Vincent Novello of the famous music publishing house. Weber

---


6 McCorkle, *Werkverzeichnis*, 146.

makes a number of appearances in Schumann’s early diaries as a friend with whom the composer spent time attending various concerts and other artistic activities. Regarding Weber, Schumann wrote, “Weber speaks in too many diminutives, which aim at more delicacy—a lovely degree of altruism, such as I seldom have found—self-sacrificing like an Italian; really a becalmed Italian.”

In the years following the publication of op. 35, the composer decided to publish four of the Kerner Lieder individually with “Erstes Grün,” “Wanderung,” “Stille Liebe,” and “Frage.” Both “Erstes Grün” and “Stille Liebe” appeared in September 1844 as part of a collection of German Lieder in the Allemannia—Sammlung deutscher Gesänge as songs.

Illustration 3.1: Cover page of the first edition (volume I) for op. 35

8 Thü. 225.
number 21 and 22 in that publication.9 “Wanderung” and “Frage” both found their way into a subsequent version of this same collection in August 1849 as songs 29 and 30, respectively.10 The latter also occasioned an advertisement in two journals, most notably the *NZfM* from 19 August 1849.11

The publication of the first edition divided the songs into two uneven volumes of five and seven songs respectively.12 However, the complete edition of Schumann’s works from 1881 (and other more modern ones) effaces this original division of the songs into volumes by presenting them in a continuous set, which has a variety of ramifications for the opus. Much of the early scholarly commentary about op. 35 only considers the way the songs fall in the old complete edition and not in the initial version arranged in two volumes. But consumers in Schumann’s time could buy one or the other volume separately. What is more, the composer pulled a handful of numbers, as noted above, to publish individually in music serials. Thus, while some scholars have regarded op. 35 as an indivisible whole, the first edition and subsequent treatment of the cycle tell a different story.

Although the early scholarly perception of op. 35 tends to overlook the first edition, the division of the cycle into separate volumes affected the overall plan for the cycle—both its tonal and narrative design—significantly. As we shall see in the following section, all of these issues came in to play to determine the final published state of Schumann’s *Liederreihe*.

---


10 Ibid.

11 *NZfM* 31/15 (19 August 1849), 84.

12 It should be noted that the final number of songs is different from the total Schumann realized into *LbIII*. We will discuss the composer’s omission of two numbers from his realizations in a later portion of this chapter as well as his division of the cycle into two separate volumes.
The Narrative Organization of the Songs into Op. 35

In the previous chapters we noted that Schumann approached the songs in two different stages: the first involves the compositional sequence recorded in *TbIII* and *LbIII*, and the second entailed their realization in the Berlin autograph. Schumann once again decided to reorganize the Kerner songs in preparing the first edition. In doing so, the songs diverged from the sequence we observed in previous compositional stages. The following chart shows how Schumann re-ordered the collection as a whole and then how they ultimately appeared in two volumes (see Table 3.1).

**Table 3.1: The Order of the Kerner Songs from the First Edition Print**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Volume I</th>
<th>Key</th>
<th>Volume II</th>
<th>Key</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) “Lust der Sturmnacht”</td>
<td>e flat</td>
<td>6) “Auf das Trinkglas eines verstorbenen Freundes”</td>
<td>E flat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) “Stirb, Lieb’ und Freud’!”</td>
<td>A flat</td>
<td>7) “Wanderung”</td>
<td>B flat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) “Wanderlied”</td>
<td>B flat</td>
<td>8) “Stille Liebe”</td>
<td>E flat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) “Erstes Grün”</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>9) “Frage”</td>
<td>E flat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) “Sehnsucht nach der Waldgegend”</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>10) “Stille Thränen”</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11) “Wer machte dich so krank?”</td>
<td>A flat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12) “Alte Laute”</td>
<td>A flat</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

But because we do not have a fair copy sent to the publisher or any instructions Schumann might have given during proof reading, we cannot say how the songs actually assumed their final order, or how they came to be divided into volumes. It is hard to imagine that the fair copy (which we must guess was not bound) had instructions placed on it regarding the number of songs in a volume. The fair copy probably contained only the numbers that were
finally published as part of op. 35. Thus, the publication in two separate *Hefte*, with an uneven number of songs in both volumes, most likely did not occur here. The decision about the final sequence of numbers could have been made when the fair copy was prepared, but in other cycles Schumann continued to revise numbers and rearrange their sequence even after the fair copy was processed into engraver’s proofs. He also continued to revise the text. In the case of *Dichterliebe*, we know that the plan for twenty songs ultimately morphed into sixteen. And Hallmark cites the proofreader, Roitsch, who recalled that the composer, “was always changing things in the proofs of his music...He said that the composer made many changes in the first proofs for op. 48 and then restored his first readings in the final ones.”

The division of the first edition in two volumes above could have resulted from a number of possible considerations. Although the initial volume immediately retains the order of the first two numbers entered into the Berlin autograph, “Lust der Sturmnacht” and “Stirb, Lieb’ und Freud’!” (the latter was also designated for a tenor for the first edition), the volume proceeds with three songs that Schumann entered towards the end of the Kerner realizations, “Wanderlied,” “Erstes Grün,” and “Sehnsucht nach der Waldgegend.” This begins a trend that continues in the disposition of the second volume, where we find a completely different order of songs from their compositional sequence. With the exception of “Wer machte dich so krank?” and “Alte Laute,” none of the songs fall even remotely close

---

13 Ibid., 19. In this instance, Schumann appears concerned with changes within the songs—“restored his first readings”—not to the order.

14 The following are general comments about the first edition. We will explore why Schumann might have decided to omit “Trost im Gesang” and “Sängers Trost” in subsequent portions of the chapter.

15 Schumann places the suggestion “Tenor vorzugsweise” for “Stirb, Lieb’ und Freud’!”.

16 The vocal suggestion “vorzugsweise Bariton” for “Wer machte dich so krank?” carried over from *LbIII* for the first edition.
to the sequence in which they appear in *LbIII*. Furthermore, Schumann omitted two songs that appeared in the Berlin autograph, “Sängers Trost” and “Trost im Gesang.” In short, the first edition bears little resemblance to the ‘short cycle of Kerner’s songs’ he had begun in November 1840. The casting of the songs into two uneven volumes, moreover, may have originated in a practical matter involving the total page count in each gathering. Schumann probably envisaged the op. 35 songs dispersed into two parallel volumes of six songs each. The notion of equal distribution certainly applied for the publication of *Dichterliebe*, as shown by both Hallmark and Beate Julia Perrey, who note the composer’s intent to divide the cycle into two equal halves. However, publishing op. 35 in this manner would have posed some problems. Although the second volume of the first edition contains more numbers than the first, we find that both volumes are relatively close in total page count: fourteen for the first and thirteen for the second. If an even number of six songs appeared in both volumes, the ratio would have changed to seventeen and ten pages, respectively. Klemm most likely considered a fairly even number for the two installments more practicable. Another consideration might have been an awkward page turn for the pianist if “Wanderung” was the first song of the second volume instead of “Auf das Trinkglas eines verstorbenen Freundes.” Due to these practical exigencies, both Klemm and Schumann in either an oral

17 *TbII*, 126.

18 See Hallmark, *Dichterliebe*, 124 and Beate Julia Perrey, *Schumann’s Dichterliebe and Early Romantic Poetics: Fragmentation and Desire* (New York, 2002), 117-19. Perrey notes in a letter from Schumann to the publishers Bote & Bock (who rejected the cycle) written on 2 June 1840, that the composer initially wanted the 20 *Lieder und Gesänge* published as a whole, but anticipated difficulties in doing so. Thus, he suggested a compromise of one copy as a whole cycle, and another that divided into two halves. In a later attempt to publish *Dichterliebe*, a letter from 6 August 1843 to Breitkopf & Härtel (who also rejected the cycle) Schumann stated, “The best would be to divide it into two booklets where each one comprised 20-22 plates.”

19 In measure 20 of “Wanderung” (the final bar of music on that page) both hands are playing in the piano and due to the rapid tempo of the song, making a page turn at this point would be quite difficult. Schumann seems to have eased the execution of this particular part by placing “Auf das Trinkglas” ahead of it. Thus, the whole of “Wanderung” opens over two pages.
exchange or lost written exchange, probably decided to distribute the songs into two volumes that were more convenient in terms of count and page turns.

In addition to the reordering of the numbers for the first edition, two songs “Sängers Trost” and “Trost im Gesang” were omitted from the final disposition. In his a recent examination about the reordering of songs in *Dichterliebe* (also published in two volumes), Berthold Hoeckner writes that although Schumann omitted four songs from *Dichterliebe* they were “still unquestionably part of an intricate overall tonal design and narrative plan. By taking them out, Schumann may have wanted to avoid the duplication of keys and poetic motifs.”

Although we cannot know the exact mechanism by which Schumann reorganized the Kerner songs or any last-minute decisions he might have made, we can still speculate about the steps taken by the composer to prepare the songs for publication, and establish opus 35 as an entity. In exploring the specific aspects of the first edition, I shall pay particular attention to narrative trajectory, tonal scheme, and to a more penetrating view of some particular changes Schumann made in establishing the final state of opus 35.

**Narrative Trajectory**

As I noted in Chapter 1, a variety of subjects Schumann chose from Kerner’s poems were apparent: love, love lost, nature, and traveling, to name a few. However, neither the selection of texts nor their realization into *LbIII* showed any fixed narrative order. As we shall see, Schumann’s organization of the songs into op. 35 created a literary tract representative of a nineteenth-century *Wanderlieder* cycle. According to Barbara Turchin, the *Wanderlieder* cycle is an example of a common type of song cycle based on typical Romantic themes in literature and philosophical thought:

---

the travels of the wanderer symbolize mankind’s quest to recover, through a circuitous journey, the lost primal state of unity experienced in the Golden Age of long ago. The circuitous journey is both an educational and psychological process which begins with man’s fall from unity into self-division, self-conflict, and self-contradiction. The dynamic of this process is to move towards balance, an integration, a closure of these divisions and contraries. The goal of the inner quest is to achieve a higher state of unity, a greater wholeness through increased self-awareness. The beginning and end of the journey is man’s ancestral home which is often linked with a female counterpart from whom the wanderer departs when setting out. The achievement of the goal is frequently portrayed in a scene of recognition and reconciliation, and is often symbolized in a loving union with the female other.21

In addition to the literary elements above, both Turchin and David Ferris note another important aspect of narrative in a Wanderlieder cycle. Many of the texts often use changes in season and in the traveler’s surroundings as a metaphor for his emotions. This notion is also key to understanding how the narrative development operates in the cycle. For Ferris, the progressions from evening to nighttime or winter to spring may determine the order of two or more successive numbers, but usually not the entire cycle. Rather, it is the cyclical aspect of the season’s passage, and not their particular sequence that often plays into a larger, unifying context.22 The idea of a “larger, unifying context” is a notion central to Wanderlieder cycles, but is not only limited to the passages of seasons or time. We also find recurring images, from nature to the traveler’s homeland and his beloved, that often return at various points (and often not in consecutive songs) to relate individual numbers. While the order of songs in a wandering cycle may seem independent from one another, we find a network of literary mechanisms that unify the individual members.23 Thus, according to Ferris, a continuously


sequential plot is “of relatively little significance in understanding how [Wanderlieder cycles] work as a coherent text.”

Using this idea, we can now approach the ordering of op. 35.

If the narrative for op. 35 does not follow a linear trajectory, we can still gain a sense of how the songs as a whole achieve coherence, nonetheless. While the composer ultimately placed many of the songs in a different sequence than they appear in LbIII, he retained the order of the first two numbers with “Lust der Sturmnacht” and “Stirb, Lieb’ und Freud’!.” This pairing, for all intents and purposes, creates the point from which the rest of the cycle proceeds. We might think that Schumann intended from the start for “Lust der Sturmnacht” to come first. In examining the previous compositional stages, we noted that it was among the first settings he composed in November 1840, and it appears as the initial song in the Berlin autograph. Accorded privilege of place, “Lust der Sturmnacht” provides the basis for the rest of the opus. The composer introduces a persona who describes a violent storm from confines of his room, in the arms of his beloved. At various points he alludes to traveling, and he compares his own comfort to several aspects of nature. These poetic tropes—love, nature, and traveling—return in many other texts in the cycle. Schumann then initiates narrative progression with the ballad “Stirb, Lieb’ und Freud’!,” where the security and comfort the persona feels with his beloved in the previous song transforms itself suddenly into pain and loss. Here, his “pious maid” has taken the veil, and we learn through a twist in the end that the narrator of the text is the persona himself, expressing his grief and

---


25 At this point, we will deal with the narrative under the hypothesis that Schumann originally intended a division into two volumes of six songs each. We will later deal with implications of an uneven division.
disdain. Only in the final moments of “Stirb, Lieb’ und Freud’!” can we make any connection to the beloved mentioned in “Lust der Sturmnacht.”

The narrative then progresses from “Stirb’, Lieb und Freud’!” to the drinking song “Wanderlied,” where the persona asserts the necessity of travel from his homeland. Although we noted in chapter one that the tone of “Wanderlied” was positive (at no point does the speaker intimate that an unfortunate event has caused him to leave), Schumann’s placement of the song at this point has several implications. First, “Wanderlied” offers a point of departure from the amorous topoi in the two previous songs, coupling the subjects of traveling and nature, themes that will play a major role in dictating the later course of the cycle. Second, the persona’s urge to travel in “Wanderlied” offers a sense of resolution. This involves nostalgia: memories of home, friends, nature, and love determine the persona’s course. And the persona’s recollection of love offers him hope in his travels, “so he might feel at home in the most distant land.” Thus, we might consider “Wanderlied” as a link to the previous poems because the justification for travel stems not merely from painful recollection but from memories of his past that remind him of happier times.

The course of the wayfaring narrative that begins in “Wanderlied” continues in the next two songs, with “Erstes Grün” serving as the first in the cycle to introduce nature as an independent and meaningful element. While the previous song struck a positive note, “Erstes Grün” presents a more melancholy tone: the persona looks to nature as an escape from pain occasioned by human interaction. Consolation through nature also permeates the next song, “Sehnsucht nach der Waldgegend”: as the persona continues on his travels, he revisits memories the forests, yet he feels displaced. And in the end, he has lost his ability to sing. This ominous notion continues in “Auf das Trinkglas eines verstorbenen Freundes,” in which
the persona reminisces over the cup of a departed friend. Here we find a direct connection to “Sehnsucht nach der Waldgegend,” in the nostalgia of the persona. Although the speaker intimates a sense of alienation from the memories of his homeland in the previous song, his recollections of his friend in this instance lead him to an altogether different, supernatural place.

“Auf das Trinkglas” offers a way we might see how Schumann initially designed two volumes of six songs each. Based on the sequence of keys noted in Table 3.1, a prospective volume both opening and closing in E flat would have rounded the first group better, tonally, than a volume closing in G minor (as it actually does in the first edition with “Sehnsucht nach der Waldgegend”). And in terms of narrative, “Auf das Trinkglas” not only follows the melancholy of “Sehnsucht nach der Waldgegend” with the subject of death, but it would have also have paralleled the same theme in the final number of the next volume, “Alte Laute,” thus rounding both installments in thoughts of death.

The next hypothetical volume of six songs would then begin by reintroducing the notion of wayfaring in “Wanderung.” Although the notion of traveling is readily apparent here, the speaker calls to mind the separation from his beloved. His sense of losing her forces him to contemplate his present course. Not only are we reminded of his lost love, but also the notion of his alienation as a result. In essence, he reiterates the very reasons he has decided to travel. “Stille Liebe” further illustrates the speaker’s suffering due to the loss of his beloved, since his torment forces him to sing, “a song of the bitter pain of not being able to sing.”

At this point that the direction of the narrative takes a different turn for the next two songs: while the subjects of lost love, traveling, and nature pervade the former numbers, the persona’s emotions change. Even though he continues to contemplate his lost love in “Stille
Liebe,” the text also entails a search for consolation. Ironically, he produces a song about not singing. The speaker then follows in “Frage” with a series of rhetorical statements about his surroundings, describing items in nature that help him in his time of adversity where he concludes, “If you did not exist...what joy would fill a heart in times of sorrow?” This sentiment also holds true for the next song “Stille Thränen,” but in this case the persona views the consolation he finds in nature differently. The speaker intimates that his comfort may be only transitory, thus leading us to question whether his suffering has truly eased.

The final question in “Stille Thränen” sets the stage perfectly for the content of the final pair of songs that conclude the cycle. As we have seen, the content of the second volume involves notions of wandering and the various connotations of what they mean to the persona as he reflects on his lost love. The second volume of songs, then, speaks to questions of whether wayfaring can offer consolation. Throughout the three previous numbers the speaker’s hope for consolation slowly unravels to the point that he questions whether or not nature will provide solace for his pain. To a certain degree the persona answers this question in “Wer machte dich so krank?,” where he again asks rhetorical questions concerning his situation. On the one hand, his personal query here is not only rhetorical but also provides a means to reflect upon many of the important images that surfaced in previous songs. He reminds us of the trees, flowers in the valley, starry nights, grass, and, perhaps, in a foreboding way, the cup of wine from which he drank. In the end, he concludes that though nature offers consolation, mankind still grants him no peace.

While nature offers the persona some comfort in “Wer machte dich so krank?,” it is only fleeting. Once again the speaker uses self-reflection and memory in the concluding number, “Alte Laute,” but this time they determine his fate. Here the speaker becomes
completely alienated: neither the singing bird nor the blooming tree can save him from his troubling dream. Though he is nostalgic for the “old sounds” of his youth, they remind him of a time when he trusted the world. His final conclusion completely negates the joys of nature (and perhaps, wayfaring) that he praised in previous songs. No “flower’s spice” can heal him and in the end, he resigns himself to death.

While the volumes worked better as 6+6 in terms of narrative and key, we need to consider the implications of an uneven division of the songs that resulted from practical considerations. The first volume’s progression, which initially ended with the subject of death, traces a trajectory from security to lost love in the first two songs, from alienation and wandering in the next two numbers, to the debilitation of sadness at erotic loss in the final song. By beginning volume two with “Auf das Trinkglas,” the second installment thus becomes rounded by the subject of death. Furthermore, “Auf das Trinkglas” might also offer parallel connections to the previous volume by providing motivation (personal loss) for wayfaring that parallels “Stirb, Lieb’ und Freud’!”26 The next number in the sequence, “Wanderung,” might draw a parallel to “Wanderlied,” not only by subject matter, but also by key (B-flat major). “Stille Liebe” also offers another parallel to “Erstes Grün,” where the speaker’s suffering from mankind in the latter song is reiterated as torment in the former. We also might view the speaker’s rhetorical statements about his surroundings in “Frage” mirroring those in “Sehnsucht nach der Waldgegend.”

Even though my speculative hypothesis about Schumann’s initial plan for op. 35 differs from the way it ultimately appeared for practical reasons in the first edition, the cycle

as a whole coheres as a twelve-number sequence. From the bliss the persona feels in “Lust der Sturmnacht” to the pain and loss in “Stirb, Lieb’ und Freud’!,” the stage is set for the speaker to leave his home in “Wanderlied.” “Erstes Grün” and “Sehnsucht nach der Waldgegend” introduce the persona’s consolation in nature, followed by his sense of alienation as he reminisces about death in “Auf das Trinkglas.” “Wanderung” offers some retracing of these subjects in the middle of the cycle, not only by reiterating the subject of traveling, but by recalling his lost love. And although this reintroduction of wayfaring offers hope as the traveler sets out, mischance again leads him to a gloomy conclusion. The persona’s hope for consolation falls apart in the remaining numbers: though nature offers a brief respite, humankind is still the source of his anguish. Ultimately, this self-reflection seals his fate, and he is resigned to death.

**The Musical Organization of Op. 35**

**Tonal Plan**

As we discovered in the previous chapter, Schumann appears to have entered the songs into *LbIII* according to key areas (with the odd exception of “Lust der Sturmnacht”); however, the final version of op. 35 does not maintain the original order at all. When the composer rearranged his raw material for publication, he created a new set of tonal relationships that integrate the songs in a variety of ways. As Barbara Turchin notes of Schumann’s approach in general and of op. 35 in particular:

Schumann’s better known song cycles can be described, in general, as a synthesis of Beethoven’s and Kreutzer’s approach to the Liederkreis. The individual song is treated as a physically separate entity, though not always a tonally independent unit. Adjacent songs are most frequently related in the first or second degree. Reinforcing the close tonal relationships that typically can be found in both the small- and large-scale design of his cycles, are recurring motives, melodic figures, and harmonic progressions that give each
cycle its distinctive sound. This characterization likewise applies to the Kerner Liederreihe.27

An immediate result of Schumann’s reordering of the songs reveals a far more calculated tonal plan than the order of the initial complete drafts. Table 3.2 compares how Schumann reorganized the realizations in \textit{LbIII} to form the volumes of the first edition print, with special emphasis on the tonic key of each number.

\textbf{Table 3.2: A Comparison of the Tonic Keys in \textit{LbIII} and in the First Edition of Op. 35}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Song and Date of Composition</th>
<th>\textit{LbIII} Key</th>
<th>First Edition</th>
<th>Key</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) “Lust der Sturmnacht” (20.11.40)</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>1) “Lust der Sturmnacht” e \textsuperscript{b}</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) “Stirb, Lieb’ und Freud’!” (22.11.40)</td>
<td>A \textsuperscript{b}</td>
<td>2) “Stirb, Lieb’ und Freud’!” A \textsuperscript{b}</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) “Trost im Gesang” (20.11.40)</td>
<td>E \textsuperscript{b}</td>
<td>3) “Wanderlied” B \textsuperscript{b}</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) “Wanderung” (23.11.40)</td>
<td>B \textsuperscript{b}</td>
<td>4) “Erstes Grün” g</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) “An das Trinkglas eines verstorbenen Freundes” (25.11.40)</td>
<td>E \textsuperscript{b}</td>
<td>5) “Sehnsucht nach der Waldgegend” g</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) “Stille Liebe” (24.11.40)</td>
<td>E \textsuperscript{b}</td>
<td>6) “Auf das Trinkglas eines verstorbenen Freundes” E \textsuperscript{b}</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) “Stille Thränen”</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>7) “Wanderung” B \textsuperscript{b}</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) “Frage” (11.40)</td>
<td>E \textsuperscript{b}</td>
<td>8) “Stille Liebe” E \textsuperscript{b}</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9) “Wer machte Dich so krank?” (11.12.40)</td>
<td>A \textsuperscript{b}</td>
<td>9) “Frage” E \textsuperscript{b}</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10) “Alte Laute” (no date)</td>
<td>A \textsuperscript{b}</td>
<td>10) “Stille Thränen” C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11) “Sehnsucht nach der Waldgegend” (no date)</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>11) “Wer machte dich so krank?” A \textsuperscript{b}</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12) “Erstes Grün” (7.12.40)</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>12) “Alte Laute” A \textsuperscript{b}</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13) “Sängers Trost” (18.12.40)</td>
<td>g</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14) “Wanderlied” (29.12.40)</td>
<td>B \textsuperscript{b}</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

27 Turchin, “Wanderlieder Cycle,” 516. Although we will visit various commentaries regarding op. 35 in the next chapter, Turchin’s analysis of the melodic and tonal plan for op. 35 will be used as the foundation for our own examination of the cycle.
The rearrangement of the songs in the final collection obviously produced a new sequence of keys. In the realizations, the first six songs revolve around the key of E flat with the exception of “Lust der Sturmnacht” in E minor. In his reordering of the songs, Schumann sought to preserve an E flat key area for the first three numbers. This becomes apparent because he altered “Lust der Sturmnacht” from E minor to E-flat minor for the first edition. Consequently, the cycle progresses more logically to the next two songs, written in A flat and B flat, respectively. This progression stays within a B flat key signature with two songs in its relative minor. If we suppose that Schumann originally planned six songs per volume, “Auf das Trinkglas” then rounds the hypothetical first volume in E flat. “Wanderung” in B flat (and also the start of the second hypothetical volume), falls as the dominant between the previous number and the two succeeding songs. The Liederreihe concludes with the final three songs in C and A-flat major, respectively.

Even though the hypothetical initial division of the cycle into six songs per volume is not reflected in the final disposition, the division of the numbers into uneven installments still makes some sense tonally. With “Auf das Trinkglas” as the first song of the second volume, the progression of the first volume begins in E flat and ends in G minor. The first four songs of the second volume then revolve around an E flat. The songs further relate by adjacent harmonic and tonal relationships. For the first volume, the relationship of relative major to relative minor for the final three songs is extremely close. And for the second volume, we find the progression moves by both chromatic mediants (E flat to C from “Auf das Trinkglas” to “Stille Thränen” and from C to A flat in the final song pair), and by implied

---

28 At this point, we are only dealing with the tonics indicated by the key signatures, not with the key areas that Schumann explores quite liberally in the middle of songs.
dominants. This latter notion is most evident in the how E flat can serve as the dominant to A flat, a progression Schumann alludes to in the first two songs of volume one and then brings to its logical conclusion in volume two.

The tonal connections in op. 35 seem to have played the most important role in guiding Schumann’s overall ordering of the collection as a whole. While we noted some general harmonic and tonal relationships above, there are many deeper musical connections that exist in the cycle where tonal implications specifically guided the composer in his organization of the songs. One of the first examples of this is found in “Stirb, Lieb’ und Freud’!,” which creates a point from which the cycle proceeds harmonically. The song poses a tonal question for Turchin: while A-flat major is the tonic for the song, it is replaced by an F minor tonality at its conclusion. As Turchin notes, although the key of F minor is established, it is one “that is implied by strong dominant preparation [and] one that is not explicitly achieved. As a result, the cadentially reinforced final C-major triad is yet heard as the dominant of F minor.”

Schumann creates a bridge, however, between the second and third numbers by directly addressing the tonal question posed at the conclusion of “Stirb, Lieb’ und Freud’!” The piano’s prelude to “Wanderlied” opens on four octaves on F in the piano part, which is then used to establish the dominant of the song’s B-flat major tonality. While Turchin notes that this is one of the ways Schumann intentionally avoided tonal clarification in order to emphasize crucial turning points in the poetic sequence, the movement to B-flat major is

29 Although Schumann uses an E flat key signature he clearly means E-flat minor, since he immediately flattens G for the repeating chords in the accompaniment.

30 Ibid., 517.

hardly a stretch. In this case, the loss of the persona’s beloved causes him to set out on his travels. And while Turchin feels that the lack of tonal resolution is symbolic of this (“the bridge that connects the two songs leads the wanderer in an unexpected direction.”), we might regard this differently since the ending of “Stirb” plays a significant role to the beginning of “Wanderlied.” In essence, the wanderer is not led so much in an unexpected direction, but further along the progression of the narrative.

While Turchin’s analysis suggests that Schumann avoided tonal clarification, there are several other portions of the songs from the first volume that relate more directly. In addition to the Picardy third ending to “Stirb, Lieb’ und Freud’!” that serves as a dominant

31 Ibid.
preparation for “Wanderlied,” another important key relationship exists between the two: for both songs an internal tonal progress leads to G-flat major. In “Stirb,” this is a momentary harmonic change; however for “Wanderlied,” G-flat major stands as the other major key area for the B section of the song and employs the use of a chromatic mediant from the tonic, B-flat major (see exx. 3.2-3.3). Furthermore, “Wanderlied” provides an important tonal link for the fourth and fifth songs with “Erstes Grün” and “Wanderlied,” both following its relative minor of B flat. Although this track might not trace an explicit tonal progression, it certainly gives evidence of organizational choices by Schumann in arranging the songs as part of a deliberate tonal design.33


The tonal progression between the volumes in the hypothetical 6+6 plan would have created a tonic to dominant relationship between “Auf das Trinkglas” and “Wanderung,” and produced a tonal progression opening volume two in B flat and ending to A flat by way of E flat. While the tonal progression between the volumes as printed might not seem so apparent,

32 Ibid.

33 I must reemphasize this point by noting the order of the song’s composition as opposed to the order in which they appear in the first edition (see Table 3.2) where “Wanderlied,” “Erstes Grün,” and “Sehnsucht” were reorganized in the first edition from their order of realization in LbIII.
the relationship between the two segments also possesses points of similarity. For one thing,

Example 3.3: mm. 32-34, “Wanderlied” first edition, vol. I, 10

the first volume begins with E-flat minor and the second, as it actually appeared, with “Auf
das Trinkglas eines verstorbenen Freundes” in E-flat major. Another relationship between the
two might be thought of (albeit a more tenuous one, but not implausible) in the sections of
“Sehnsucht” that lapse into B-flat major, thus creating a kind of dominant preparation for
“Auf das Trinkglas.” In all, “Auf das Trinkglas” serves as a basis for the key areas of the next
four songs in succession (with an intermediate dominant following “Trinkglas” in
“Wanderung”), all of which relate to its tonic, E-flat major.

The next two numbers, “Stille Liebe” and “Frage,” return to the E-flat major tonality
prepared by the previous songs. Between “Frage” and the next song, “Stille Thränen,” we
find that they relate in similar ways to “Stirb, Lieb’ und Freud’!” and “Wanderleid.” In the
case of “Frage,” Schumann seems to respond musically to the rhetorical elements in the
poem. The result is a song that does not establish a tonal center. Although it begins by
reiterating the E-flat tonality from the previous song in “Stille Liebe,” it does not reinforce
that key cadentially. Instead, “Frage” modulates to A-flat major then by-passes it, and
concludes rather unexpectedly on a G-major triad (see ex. 3.4) for its final cadence.\[34\] In this

---

34 Ibid.
sense, the tonal situation resembles that of “Stirb, Lieb’ und Freud’!,” where a half cadence at its conclusion prepares the initiation of the next song, “Wanderlied.” However, the G-major tonality of the conclusion for “Frage” does provide a more definitive tonal bridge, since it sets the stage as the dominant for the next song, “Stille Thränen.” Thus, the tonal ambiguity of “Frage,” ending in a puzzling cadence on a G-major chord, actually provides the turning point which moves the cycle, both musically and poetically, in another direction. This is evident in the narrative progression, where the speaker intimates that the comfort he felt in “Frage” may be only transitory, and leads him to question whether his suffering has truly eased in “Stille Thränen.”

Example 3.4: mm. 15-16, “Frage,” first edition, vol. II, 10

“Stille Thränen” furthers this sentiment poetically, where the speaker states that his comfort may be only transitory (by questioning whether his suffering has truly passed). The poetic content of “Stille Thränen” then presages the end of the persona’s travels, and as we noted earlier, the conceit of this text sets the stage for the conclusion of the cycle found in the final pair of songs. Even though there is a direct tonal connection between “Frage” and “Stille Thränen” and the narrative follows a logical course, Turchin claims that Schumann
makes no attempt to link it to “Wer machte dich so krank?” tonally. She focuses on the extended postlude that, while arriving on a C major cadence at its conclusion, seems to imply with all its B flats a half cadence in F major (see ex. 3.5).


35 Ibid.
Several tonal relationships between the final four songs link them together, however. First, there is the dominant relationship between the E-flat major of “Frage” and the A-flat major of the last two songs. This parallels the opening movement of from E-flat major of “Lust der Sturmnacht” to the A-flat major of “Stirb, Lieb’ und Freud’!” Furthermore, the subject matter of “Stille Thränen” is addressed in the final song pair: since the wayfarer’s travels have now concluded, he has a chance to reflect upon his course and determine his destiny. And although the poetic connection seems rather apparent, a tonal connection between “Stille Thränen” and “Wer machte dich so krank?” and “Alte Laute” also exists. First, the inner tonal progressions of “Stille Thränen” prepare the final song pair, since it modulates directly to A-flat major from C major by common tone (see ex. 3.6). While Turchin finds the final cadence of “Stille Thränen” ambiguous because it functions as an implied dominant, we can look at this a different way. The penultimate chord in final measure of the postlude bears an implied D-sharp diminished seventh chord at the cadence. D sharp respells enharmonically as E flat, the dominant root in A flat (see example 3.5) What is more, the final C major chord in “Stille Thränen” suggests a tonic to dominant progression to the opening of “Wer machte dich so krank?,” where G major begins the prelude and is re-emphasized as an octave in the third measure (see ex. 3.7). A G-major sonority also plays an important role at the opening of “Alte Laute,” where Schumann uses a variation of the opening to the previous song (see ex. 3.8). While both preludes seem quite different on the surface, the G sonority links the two together, because Schumann emphasizes a sustained G for one and one half measures before arriving on an identical pick-up chord before the voice enters. Thus, the closing song pair does not seem quite as separate from the preceding
number, but, rather, connected through both the continuation of the narrative and the tonal bridges from the previous songs, and similar approaches in their preludes.


Finally, an overall tonal scheme for op. 35 comes to light with the final pair of songs.

The E-flat minor-major with which we begin the cycle in “Lust der Sturmnacht” stands as the
dominant to the A-flat major with which we conclude. In between, this relationship surfaces in other ways. The dominant to tonic foundation is set initially between “Lust der Sturmnacht” and “Stirb’, Lieb und Freud’!,” where Schumann’s change to the key signature of the former song to E-flat major-minor produced an immediate dominant to tonic link with the latter number in A flat. And this relationship that begins the cycle frames the course of it as a whole, since it reaches its conclusion in A flat with both “Wer machte dich so krank?” and “Alte Laute.”

Amid the starting and concluding numbers of op. 35 the tonal path for the songs produces connections through overall key areas (as indicated by key signatures) and through intricate harmonic workings. From “Lust der Sturmnacht” to “Stirb’, Lieb und Freud’!,” we found our initial path, harmonically. The second number’s final cadence in C major then led to a secondary dominant preparation for “Wanderlied.” We also found that “Stirb’” portends an important key area in “Wanderlied” through G-flat major. The latter songs then leads to two numbers in “Erstes Grün” and “Sehnsucht nach der Waldgegend” that fall in its relative minor, G. Tonal connections between “Sehnsucht” and “Auf das Trinkglas eines verstorbenen Freundes” continue by virtue of references in the former song to B-flat major. “Auf das Trinkglas” further serves as a tonic to dominant preparation the next number, “Wanderung,” where the harmonic progression returns to E-flat major in the next two songs, “Stille Liebe” and “Frage.” From “Stille Liebe” through the final song pair “Wer machte dich so krank” and “Alte Laute,” we discovered ways in which all four songs that link them together. “Frage” initially sets the stage with its dominant preparation on a half-cadence in G that leads to “Stille Thränen” in C major. In addition, we noted another tonic to dominant relationship between the E-flat major of “Frage” and the A-flat major tonic of the final songs.
And finally, the closing cadence in “Stille Thränen” in C major serves as another important
tonic-to-dominant progression to the final song pair, since both songs begin with a G major
prelude before unfolding in A-flat major.

**Melodic Integration**

While the tonal organization of op. 35 seems to have provided the most important method of
coherence for Schumann, indications of cyclicity in the collection may also appear in some
melodic allusion. A closer look at the opening melodic figures for the second (“Stirb, Lieb’
und Freud’!”) and last song (“Alte Laute”) reveals, according to Turchin, that they unfold
with a composed leap of a perfect fourth from E-flat to A-flat (see exx. 3.9 a-b). While the
opening movement of a fourth is not just limited to these songs (“Wanderung,” and “Auf das
Trinkglas eines verstorbenen Frendes,” both begin with a rising fourth—F to B flat and B
flat to E flat, respectively), a more extended look at the melodic content of “Stirb’ Lieb und
Freud’!,” shows similarities that go beyond this rather common opening gesture. After the
rising fourth in “Stirb’,” the melody descends by step to G and F before ascending back to A
through those same notes. This rising line from F to A is similar for “Alte Laute” in the fifth
and sixth measure and in essence, the melody for this closing song derives in part from
“Stirb, Lieb’ und Freud’!” 36

Another melodic phrase shared between both songs also has significance. At several
emotive moments in “Stirb, Lieb’ und Freud’!” Schumann uses the melodic passage found in

---

36 Ibid. Even though “Wer machte dich so krank?” precedes “Alte Laute” with the same melody, we will view
the latter song in light of the subject of musical rounding.

Noch langsamer und leiser.


example 3.10a three different times and in three different keys. A similar melodic descent is found in “Alte Laute” and operates in two ways (compare exx. 3.10a-b). First, it restates the same notes of the melody from “Stirb, Lieb’ und Freud’!” and second, even though the
melody for “Alte Laute” is an extended version of the former song, its distribution, rhythmically, closely mirrors that of “Stirb. Lieb’und Freud’!” as well.


Turchin regards the melodic phrases from “Stirb” that recur in op. 35’s final pair of songs to be significant for a number of reasons. First, these phrases in “Stirb” highlight important lines from the poem, especially the ones in which the pious maid bids farewell to earthly love and joy. This juncture marks the turning point in the poem for the persona: he reveals he is the narrator, and his heart broken at his beloved’s choice to take the veil. The allusion to this phrase in final songs is not, according to Turchin, meant to be an exact restatement, but instead a point of reminiscence: “a sound from the past that represents the
moment long ago when [the persona’s] faith and trust in love were destroyed. In this manner, Schumann entwines the past, present, and future, literally and figuratively, poetically and musically.38 Although we may regard these similarities in melodic phrases as emphasizing recollection, the reference to the melody in “Alte Laute” also relates to the persona’s final decision: alienated from the world and all its pleasures, he now resigns himself to death.

Tuchin’s examples of musical rounding through reminiscence make a convincing argument for cyclicity in op. 35. And the gesture certainly had precedence in Frauenliebe und Leben, with the recollection of the opening song in the postlude of the last for the cycle.39 Although the circumstances for both cycles vary (Schumann omitted Chamisso’s final poem from Frauenliebe und Leben in favor of a piano postlude) the subject of reminiscence is brought to the fore in each. Kristina Muxfeldt writes:

As is well known, Schumann omitted setting this self-conscious shift in narrative perspective, replacing it with a piano postlude that continues the train of the present story, representing the young widow’s just announced retreat into her world of memory. An autobiographical act thus becomes an explicit element in Chamisso’s story, but not so in Schumann’s, which sustains the presence of interior dialogue and immediate experience to the end.40 Muxfeldt continues, “Schumann’s postlude may be thought to represent a memory, and not merely a symbolic or formal return, precisely because the past is brought back through the filter of present emotion and experience.”41 While Tuchin’s analysis of melodic integration outlines an example of possible musical coherence in op. 35, this remains a very limited

37 This phrase also occurs in mm. 52 and 67 of “Stirb” in the keys of G major and F minor, respectively.
38 Ibid.
39 We must also note that Dichterliebe also presents this type of musical rounding with the quotation of the postlude of “Am leuchtenden Sommermorgen” in “Die alten, bösen Lieder”
41 Ibid., 47.
example because it represents one of the few places in the cycle where melodies relate whatsoever. Unlike Frauenliebe, where Schumann quotes his opening literally, the similarities Turchin detects are not so clearly related. This is not to say that all three songs do not show a likeness in how their melodies were composed, or lessen the allusion from “Stirb, Lieb’ und Freud’!” to “Wer machte dich so krank?” and “Alte Laute” as a case for musical rounding. However, it is difficult to establish a basis for cyclicity based on a melodic analysis alone.

A handful of other numbers in op. 35 also display some melodic relationships, and all occur in consecutive songs. However, most of these melodic similarities appear to be merely stylistic consistencies rather than deliberate allusions. We find one such example between the first two numbers “Lust der Sturmnacht” and “Stirb, Lieb’ und Freud’!” where an almost identical melody is used by Schumann. The composer employs a descending four-note pattern to arrive on an A natural (and subsequently return upwards to B flat) in both songs (see exx. 3.11 and 3.12). Another comparable melodic connection is found at the outset of both “Stille Liebe” and “Frage,” where the latter song outlines the scalar descent from G to E flat (minus the repeated notes of each tone found in the former) and then leaps similarly by a perfect fifth to B flat (see exx. 3.13-3.14).

![Example 3.11: mm. 11-12 “Lust der Sturmnacht,” first edition, vol. I, 3](image-url)
The final three songs in the first volume offer another comparable melodic relationship through the use of a descending arpeggiated chord. Both “Wanderlied” and “Erstes Grün,” begin by outlining their respective tonic chord. In the case of the former, the
melody begins on B flat and proceeds down through the tonic chord degrees to F and D to produce a first inversion triad. In “Erstes Grün” the starting pitch D is followed by descent to B flat and G, forming a root position tonic triad (compare exx. 3.15-3.16). This same technique appears in the following number “Sehnsucht nach der Waldgegend,” where the melodic descent outlines the secondary key area, F major (see ex. 3.17)


While the cycle may contain deliberate allusions in its last songs to one of the first numbers to create rounding, on the whole, the songs hold some melodic gestures in common that fall short of allusion. In some cases, the similarities in melodic content are merely stylistic commonplaces that have no further significance. But we do find other cases where these gestures lend the cycle internal consistency of melodic language. In the end, it appears that Schumann’s most important compositional device to create musical coherence among these songs came in the form of tonal relationships, since they provided the means by which he organized them, and this, in turn, offers a much stronger basis for cyclicity in op. 35.

Schumann’s Final Arrangement of op. 35

Now that we have a sense of how the songs came into their final disposition we can address how Schumann might have composed and realized the songs out of order, then arranged them in the manner he did for the final printed version. For the selection of texts, we noted in Chapter 1 that Schumann chose poems with certain topics in mind. One factor determining how the cycle would proceed came from the pairing of “Lust der Sturmnacht” and “Stirb’, Lieb und Freud’!,” both realized in LbIII in the same order as they appear in the first edition. He must have had the combination of the blissful night and subsequently lost love in mind from the outset (see Table 1.1).

Even though “Wanderlied” was the final number Schumann composed and entered into LbIII, the composer probably fashioned this song purposefully to follow “Stirb’, Lieb und Freud’!,” both as an answer to the latter’s final cadence, and to initiate the wanderer’s travels. Initially, Schumann seems to have considered the wandering songs to follow “Stirb’,” since the realizations show two ensuing numbers on the subject of traveling: “Trost im Gesang” and “Wanderung.” Either song would have fit the logical narrative course
initiated in “Lust der Sturmnacht” and “Stirb’, Lieb und Freud’!” But as we previously discovered, the final cadence in C major of “Stirb’” presents a tonal problem. This would have remained unresolved had “Trost im Gesang” followed in the sequence, because it immediately establishes an E-flat major tonality in its prelude. “Wanderung” might have offered a possible solution, since it begins on an F octave before leading to its B-flat major tonic (compare exx. 3.1 and 3.18). In this instance, however, it seems that Schumann favored a more decisive connection at the end of “Stirb’, Lieb und Freud’!” and intentionally fashioned “Wanderlied” to answer both its tonal demands (through an opening of four open octaves on F in the piano part, creating a more significant tonic to dominant progression), and to begin the wanderer’s travels.


With the exception of the first two numbers, then, the order of realization of the remaining Kerner songs in LbIII does not shed much light on how Schumann proceeded to organize the beginning of the cycle. This becomes even more evident in the sequence of what would become the next two numbers following “Wanderlied: “ “Erstes Grün,” and “Sehnsucht nach der Waldgegend,” stand as the twelfth and eleventh songs entered in LbIII, respectively (see Table 3.2).
A significant portion of the songs entered into the *Liederbücher* after “Trost im Gesang” serve an important role in what would become the latter part of op. 35. Table 3.3 shows the order of the songs from “Wanderung” to “Alte Laute” as they were realized into *LbIII* compared to their final order in the published version of op. 35. Even though the succession of these numbers as they were realized into *LbIII* does not exactly correspond to the way they would eventually appear in the first edition, they fall in very close in proximity. Schumann may have envisaged this sequence (with slight alteration) as concluding the cycle.

Table 3.3: The Order of the Songs in *LbIII* Compared to Their Place in the First Edition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LbIII</th>
<th>First Edition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Song Title, Order, and Key</strong></td>
<td><strong>Song Title, Order, and Key</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) “Wanderung”</td>
<td>B♭</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) “Auf das Trinkglas”</td>
<td>E♭</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) “Stille Liebe”</td>
<td>E♭</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) “Stille Thränen”</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) “Frage”</td>
<td>E♭</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9) “Wer machte dich so krank?”</td>
<td>A♭</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10) “Alte Laute”</td>
<td>A♭</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The order of subjects from these seven songs in *LbIII* range from the persona’s travels in “Wanderung,” to reminiscence over the cup of a departed friend in “Auf das Trinkglas.” They further include a song of praise from the speaker to his beloved in “Stille Liebe,” to both his questioning of consolation in nature and praising nature in “Stille Thränen” and
“Frage,” respectively. Finally, “Wer machte dich so krank?” speaks to alienation from nature while “Alte Laute” makes a direct reference to death.

If Schumann had an idea for beginning the cycle’s narrative with “Lust der Sturmnacht” and “Stirb’ Lieb und Freud’!”, he may have decided that these seven songs would reach an appropriate ending in “Alte Laute.” Thus, he seems to have maintained the final seven songs in relatively close proximity and slotted the remaining numbers between them and his opening pair of songs to fill out the rest of the cycle.

The notion of an established opening and conclusion provides insight as to how Schumann proceeded in organizing the remaining songs for op. 35. He would have been left with four songs to place in the inner portion of the cycle. Table 3.4 shows the beginning and ending to the cycle and also the numbers not yet selected. If the composer proceeded in the manner suggested above, he may have selected the remaining songs not only from both a tonal and narrative standpoint that proceeded from the opening numbers, but that also mirrored some of the poetic subjects of the concluding songs (i.e., that would produce two somewhat parallel volumes in print). After Schumann proceeded to resolve the tonal problem posed at the end “Stirb’, Lieb und Freud’!” with “Wanderlied,” he introduced the idea of nature in wayfaring, a theme that permeates several of texts from the final group of seven songs (particularly “Frage,” “Stille Thränen,” “Wer machte dich so krank?,” and “Alte Laute”). Thus, he selected two songs that not only describe nature, “Ertes Grün” and “Sehnsucht nach der Waldgegend,” but also create a suitable tonal progression from “Wanderlied” (since both numbers fall in “Wanderlied’s” relative minor, G).

42 Ultimately, Schumann did not select every song listed in the middle column of Table 3.4. We will discuss some of the potential reasons he might have opted to exclude them from the first edition in the next section.
Table 3.4: Comparison of Kerner Poems as Realized in *LbIII* and *{Op. 35}*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Beginning Songs</th>
<th>Songs Not Yet Selected</th>
<th>Ending Songs (in <em>LbIII</em>)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) “Lust der Sturmnacht” {1}</td>
<td>(3) “Trost im Gesang”</td>
<td>(4) “Wanderung” {7}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) “Stirb’, Lieb und Freud’!” {2}</td>
<td>(11) “Sehnsucht nach der Waldgegend” {5}</td>
<td>(5) “Auf das Trinkglas” {6}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(14) “Wanderlied” {3}</td>
<td>(12) “Erstes Grün” {4}</td>
<td>(6) “Stille Liebe” {8}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(13) “Sängers Trost”</td>
<td>(7) “Stille Thränen” {10}</td>
<td>(8) “Frage” {9}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(9) “Wer machte dich so krank?” {11}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(10) “Alte Laute” {12}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As we can see from the order of the seven songs that would eventually become songs six through twelve for op. 35 (see Table 3.3), the composer rearranged this order slightly for the first edition by switching “Auf das Trinkglas” and “Wanderung,” and also “Frage” and “Stille Thränen.” For the latter pair, he may have been concerned with both the tonal and narrative progression (specifically with regard to the last four numbers) that led to the cycle’s conclusion in “Alte Laute.” As I suggested previously, the final four songs in the first edition form their tonal and narrative progression from “Frage”: its final cadence on G stands as a dominant preparation for the C major tonic of “Stille Thränen” and also hints at the G sonority in the prelude of both “Wer machte dich so krank?” and “Alte Laute.” And his decision may also have been based on a narrative progression that would have skewed if “Frage” had followed “Stille Thränen,” since “Frage” praises elements in nature while “Stille Thränen” intimates that the persona’s comfort in nature may be only transitory. Thus, placing “Stille Thränen” prior to “Frage” would have been contradictory.
The reasons for switching “Auf das Trinkglas” and “Wanderung,” however, are not as clear. If “Wanderung” was placed after “Sehnsucht nach der Waldgegend” it would have both sustained a logical tonal progression (from G minor in the former to B-flat major in the latter), and continued the wandering narrative. But another matter could have come into play. If, Schumann originally had conceived a cycle distributed into volumes of six songs each, then volume one would begin and end in E flat. But when it was decided to arrange the volumes to create an even page count, “Auf das Trinkglas” worked relatively well in this scheme too, because it began the second volume in E flat like the first.43

Although we cannot determine the exact method by which Schumann proceeded from LbIII to his reorganization of the songs for the first edition, it is striking that most of the later piano drafts ultimately formed the conclusion of the cycle. Between the last realizations and those of the first two numbers—“Lust der Sturmnacht” and “Stirb’ Lieb und Freud’!”—that carried over seem always to have formed the beginning of the cycle in the Schumann’s mind, we can see just how the composer might have arrived at the frame in which to disperse the rest of the numbers. This process might also suggest that toward the end of composing the songs for the collection, Schumann had an increasingly clear, if somewhat tentative, idea of how the cycle would conclude.

The Deleted Songs

My previous examination of Schumann’s ordering for op. 35 still leaves the question of why he omitted “Sängers Trost” and “Trost im Gesang” from the final version. The first appeared in 1854, the latter in 1858, in two separate collections of songs, opp. 127/1 and 142/1.

43 We surmised earlier some of the reasons for why the volumes split unevenly and noted that “Wanderung” as the first song of the second volume (had the songs been disposed evenly into six per gathering) would have produced an awkward page turn for the pianist (see fn. 19 above).
respectively. The question is all the more intriguing for “Trost im Gesang,” one of the initial Kerner texts Schumann set in November 1840, and which formed part of the smaller “cycle” in his early notes about the songs in his household accounts.

Berthold Hoeckner’s discussion regarding Schumann removing songs in the case of *Dichterliebe* is relevant to op. 35, particularly with regard to elimination of songs with similar poetic themes from cycles. Hoeckner suggests that even though the four songs omitted from op. 48 were initially part of the narrative and tonal plan of the cycle, their elimination not only avoided duplicate keys and poetic motifs but, “bypassed the early appearance of stronger moods and eliminated the drastic specter of the dead beloved. During the process of revision, Schumann may have been concerned that the greater complexity of the 20 *Lieder und Gesänge* was more confusing. His changes streamlined the tonal path and tightened the narrative progression.”

The content of each of the omitted songs falls in well with the poetic tropes of the published *Liederreihe*: “Trost im Gesang,” especially, echoes the sentiments of wandering, nature, grieving, singing, and personal reflection, and “Sängers Trost” also intimates several of the poetic tropes previously noted—especially relating to “Alte Laute”—and even foreshadows the persona’s death when he describes an unvisited grave that nature will watch. But if Schumann had a specific scheme in mind for ending the cycle as we now find it, he could have found it difficult to place “Sängers Trost.” “Wer machte dich so krank?” and “Alte Laute” function together from a musical, tonal, and narrative standpoint and thus, do not detach. And even though “Sängers Trost” portends the persona’s death, it does not

44 Hoeckner, “Paths Through *Dichterliebe*,” 76.
provide as direct a reference as “Alte Laute.” “Sängers Trost” might have been a viable
option, tonally, following “Erstes Grün” and “Sehnsucht nach der Waldgegend,” also in the
tonic key of G minor (see ex. 3.19). But while it would have fit into the overall tonal scheme,
the placement of the song at this point would have skewed the narrative design by
envisioning the persona’s death too early in the poetic sequence. Hoeckner’s notion about
Schumann’s sensitivity in avoiding duplicate poetic themes is apposite: the persona’s implied
demise in “Alte Laute” is so poignant because it is not foreshadowed in any of the texts that
precede it. Thus, placing “Sängers Trost” at another spot in the cycle might not have been
appropriate to the overall narrative.

Example 3.19: mm. 1-3 “Sängers Trost”

The various reasons for omitting “Sängers Trost” from op. 35 also apply to “Trost im
Gesang.” As noted before, the latter’s poetic content sounds wandering tropes exhibited in
other songs (in particular, “Wanderlied” and “Wanderung”). But musically “Trost im
Gesang” duplicates the march topos we find in “Wanderlied,” and Schumann may have
wanted to avoid redundancy, opting for only one marching song about wayfaring.

Could the composer have substituted “Trost im Gesang” for either “Wanderlied” or
“Wanderung?” The tonal differences between the first two songs (in particular, how they
would relate to the other songs in the first volume) are striking. “Wanderlied” has several
important tonal and cadential links to the previous song, “Stirb, Lieb’ und Freud’!” and also progresses to the following numbers, “Erstes Grün” and “Sehnsucht nach der Waldgegend,” cast in the relative minor to the B-flat major of “Wanderlied.” “Trost im Gesang” offers no such coherence.

“Trost im Gesang” in place of “Wanderung” entails the same situation we found with “Wanderlied.” “Wanderung” seemingly renews the persona’s desire to travel: “Wohlauf und frisch gewandert in’s unbekannte Land!” (“Let us set off on the road to an unknown land!”), as he pays homage to the memories of his homeland. This compares relatively well to the second stanza of “Trost im Gesang”: “Er schreitet muthtig weiter die menchenleere Bahn” ("He sets forth bravely on a deserted road"). While the two songs relate in this sense, at no point in “Trost im Gesang” does the persona intimate what makes him grieve. “Wanderung,” on the other hand reveals the persona’s memory of his beloved, and this represents one of the only places in the cycle where he actually mentions “her”: “Denn ach! auf meinem Herzen trag ich ihr theures Pfand” (“On my heart I carry her dear token of love”). This reminds us of the persona’s beloved and of his ultimate reason for wandering in the second half of the cycle. In “Wanderung” this personal loss still unites him to her memory as he travels on.

While both “Sängers Trost” and “Trost im Gesang” stood within the general parameters of the published Liederreihe, either their inappropriate tonal or their narrative interrelation may have prompted omission. These factors may also have reinforced an issue of redundancy: the composer might have wanted to avoid duplicating poetic themes, and thus condensed the number of songs in order to present the narrative more lucidly. Concision seems to have been the issue that overrode all.

*    *    *
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While we have found that the narrative for op. 35 does not necessarily follow a sequential story in a strict sense, the persona’s travels trace a progression. At various points, the story unfolds through a series of events by which the persona suggests and reflects upon his past and present courses as he wanders. On the other hand, we found that the harmonic and tonal schemes of the cycle produce a fairly strong progression, as previously noted, through the various organizational and compositional choices by Schumann. As Turchin notes, “Finally, that Schumann was sensitive to the distinctive tonal features of op. 35 is suggested by his use of the descriptive term *Liederreihe*, rather than *Liederkreis* or *Liedercyclus.*”\(^ {45}\) But it also seems that Schumann took more than just the tonal aspects of op. 35 into consideration in choosing its title: the composer’s final organization of the songs shows that he was also concerned with the various ways in which its narrative was perceived. The label of *Liederreihe* for op. 35 should not detract from our perception of its status as a work. Although the designation of “Reihe” (literally “row” or “series,” i.e., concatenation) seems weaker than that of a teleologically contained “cycle,” we have outlined several aspects of musical and narrative coherence that work to bring op. 35 into focus. As we shall see in the next chapter, however, many critics perceived the Kerner *Liederreihe* as a more or less random assortment of songs, something that only increased scholarly examination has begun to refute.

\(^{45}\) Ibid., 519
Chapter IV: Reception History

“The Kerner Liederreihe,” writes Barbara Turchin, “is Schumann’s contribution to the Wanderlieder. Unfortunately, this marvelous opus has frequently been misrepresented because it has been misunderstood both with regard to poetic theme and musical substance.”¹ The few nineteenth-century critics who address op. 35 at all seem to take the merits of Kerner’s verse as a given, while more recent authors often ask why the composer chose Kerner’s poetry and offer differing opinions on its value. Nineteenth-century reviews tend to focus more on what Schumann does with the verse in individual numbers, whereas more recent commentaries focus much attention on the question of just what Schumann’s inclusion of “Liederreihe” in his title means (Hans Joachim Köhler notes that this label was unknown even at the time Schumann used it).² While all writers raise the question of whether the opus forms an entity in some way or other, Schumann’s contemporaries tend not to emphasize this question or use it for particular opprobrium, while modern writers (including that of this dissertation) increasingly examine whether op. 35 presents a coherent cycle. Recent scholarship, therefore, has become more and more interested in the tonal and narrative organization of the collection and its genesis.

Nineteenth-Century Reception

The First Substantive Review

Unfortunately, critical response to op. 35 in the years immediately following its completion was exceedingly rare. Nonetheless, a fairly thorough examination of the songs appeared in the AmZ in a review dated 19 January 1842. This serves as the only comprehensive review of the songs in printed form, and, as we shall see, with the lack of performance reviews of op. 35, it stands as our only substantial glimpse into how the songs were initially perceived after their completion:

From among the poems by Kerner, we would call attention in the first volume to no. 1, “Lust der Sturmnacht,” in which only the conclusion did not satisfy us. The whole, however, had something very suitably wintery about it. No. 2, “Stirb, Lieb und Freud” [sic] is less rich in inventiveness and too monotonous. The freshest and most accomplished [song] seems to us “Wanderlied,” which, like no. 4, “Erstes Grün,” with its charming interludes, pleased us very much. No. 5, “Sehnsucht nach der Waldgegend”: we do not find the idea that seems to form the basis of the ending successfully executed.

In the second volume in no. 6, “Auf das Trinkglas eines verstorbenen Freundes,” we run up against that kind of conception that seems to result more from calculation than from feeling. The manner of execution justifies our regarding it thus. We can say quite candidly that we were not moved by its peculiarities. No. 7, “Wanderung,” we find somewhat ordinary, and No. 8, “Stille Liebe,” quite mystically dark. All the ensuing songs bear less the stamp of the artistic than of the unusual. The consistency with which the concept is carried out is often the only thing to praise. We do not find beauty [in the songs], the main requisite in a work of art, because this does not result from the overall concept alone but also from the external manifestation. But we could never regard, for instance, no. 10, “Stille Thränen,” as beautiful [because of its] tuneless vocal part, upheld by drawn-out, stilted, peculiar harmonies. Harmonic blandishments will not help to distract from this deficiency; only a great voice with all its means of presentation would expose the faults less.

We can, in short, only offer our approval for the songs from the first volume since they appear to be more praiseworthy than those of the second.3

---

3 From an anonymous review of “Robert Schumanns Gesangkompositionen,” AmZ 44 (19 January 1842), 61-62. This translation, as well as all other subsequent translations in this chapter are mine.
David Ferris observes that nineteenth-century reviews of song cycles such as this are problematic as historical documents because

. . . they are written for a general audience and not for professional musicians, and so they tend to be imprecise and superficial. And since nineteenth-century critics are usually not very explicit about their aesthetic premises, it is easy for us to misinterpret their reviews by reading them from our own perspective and to miss the most valuable evidence they have to offer. 4

Ferris’s point highlights a few problems we might have in assessing the reviewer’s comments about op. 35. The author acknowledges the two volumes of op. 35 but refrains from commenting about the notion of a Liederreihe or issues of cyclicity. And he also offers no appraisal of its poetry. Nonetheless, there is much we can take from his commentary about the aesthetic values he considered in his review of op. 35.

Rather than reviewing op. 35 as an integral whole, the author appears more interested in an evaluation of individual songs. And with the exception of two numbers, the mystical aura of “Stille Liebe” and the “wintery” setting of “Lust der Sturmnacht,” his focus centers on Schumann’s treatment of the verse instead of describing specific musical topos. By and large, he regards Schumann’s settings generally in a negative light: in most cases, the reviewer finds the overall conception of the songs as more artificial than artistic. The reviewer does not exactly dismiss the collection altogether; instead, he implies that the conception behind a grouping or an individual song, cannot compensate for the lack of beauty in either the whole or its parts.

A closer look at the AmZ critique of op. 35 offers some distinct characterizations of individual songs. Proceeding sequentially, we find that the reviewer’s initial dissatisfaction for the songs surfaces first for “Lust der Sturmnacht,” where the ending is unsatisfying. In this instance, the reviewer might have been reacting to its conclusion in a major mode,

particularly in light of the “wintery” characterization of its setting. “Stirb, Lieb’ und Freud’!,” on the other hand, elicits an entirely different sentiment from the reviewer, since he regards it as monotonous. While it is difficult to define precisely why he regarded “Stirb” in this way, we might suppose that the mere length of it combined with its modified strophic setting, contributed to his appraisal.

Even though the reviewer is critical of the previous songs, “Wanderlied” and “Erstes Grün” receive praise, and they give us a sense of what this critic valued in the collection. The reviewer seems to dislike harmonic complexity in songs, and neither “Erstes Grün” nor “Wanderlied” make any abrupt tonal or modulatory shifts (a specific deficiency he notes in “Auf das Trinkglas”). It is odd, however, that the author admired two such different songs. “Erstes Grün” exhibits a highly lyrical manner and depicts the persona’s despair; “Wanderlied” is one of the most declamatory of the collection as a wandering song. Nevertheless, the author seems drawn to the very nature of “Wanderlied,” regarding it as the most accomplished in the set. More specifically, he accords a particular compliment to “Erstes Grün” when he refers to its “charming interludes,” each written in the parallel major in contrast to the minor-mode setting of the text.

As with “Lust der Sturmnacht,” the reviewer has a similar response to the ending of “Sehnsucht nach der Waldgegend.” In this instance, his reaction to both songs appears similar, even though Schumann’s manner of concluding each was different. While the critic might have found the change of mode at the end of “Lust der Sturmnacht” too great of a contrast, the reviewer may have also felt that the scalar postlude for “Sehnsucht,” amid a setting that is arpeggiated for the majority of the song, too incongruent.

The reviewer is especially critical in his assessment of the second volume where we initially find that “Auf das Trinkglas” elicits a opinion similar to “Stirb, Lieb’ und Freud’!”
His assessment of “Stirb” is not as detailed, but he gives us a sense of the specific musical feature to which he objected in “Auf das Trinkglas”: of all the Kerner settings it possesses one of the most complex harmonic schemes. Even though the song begins in E-flat major, it touches at various points on D-flat major, F minor, G-flat major, and C-flat major. The composer may have deployed such wide-ranging modulations to depict the persona’s various feelings in remembering his departed friend, but the reviewer apparently felt this approach too convoluted tonally.

Although the reviewer gives no details, his description of “Wanderung” as “ordinary” might have been based in large part on his admiration for “Wanderlied.” Since both texts share a wandering topos, he may have compared Schumann’s treatment of this subject in both songs. As we just observed, his fondness for “Wanderlied” as “the freshest and most accomplished” was most likely due to the song’s setting as a lively and quintessential wanderer’s march. “Wanderung’s” approach is far different, with the vocal part frolicking throughout most of the setting (in 6/8 time), before arriving at a declamatory conclusion. Although we previously commented on how this reviewer offered no appraisal of any specific poetic element, it may be in this case that he recognized a common poetic thread between the two songs, favoring Schumann’s specific musical approach in only one of them.

Of particular interest is his characterization of “Stille Liebe” as mystically dark. Although Schumann’s setting creates a lamenting “song of praise” about the persona’s inability to sing for his beloved, it is difficult to determine what exactly gave the author a “dark” impression, since the majority of the setting falls in a major mode highlighted by a flourish of arpeggiations in the piano for the final strophe. In this instance, the reviewer might have been responding to the poetry itself instead of the music, since the poem’s ironic conceit reveals the angst that leads to the persona’s torment.
Even though the reviewer only identifies one of the remaining four songs by name, he regards the rest of the numbers as less artistic and more unusual, and though they are consistent in their conception, he faults their lack of beauty. While the reviewer notes a specific deficiency in “Stille Thränen,” his reason for labeling the other songs is this group as “unusual” is not as apparent. But if we regard the cycle as the author has, song by song, we can better understand what he meant. As previously noted in “Frage,” Schumann’s setting concludes on a half cadence in G major. Although I suggested earlier (in Chapter 3) that the composer had responded to the persona’s rhetorical question at the song’s conclusion, the reviewer might have questioned the harmonic soundness of this gesture.

As with “Auf das Trinkglas,” the critic evinces a disdain for complicated harmonic movement in his analysis of “Stille Thränen,” where he reacts to the highly chromatic vocal setting as “tuneless.” An equally important part of his assessment notes the peculiar, drawn-out harmonies of the accompaniment. This latter characterization of “Stille Thränen” seems to result from two elements. The first may be the song’s very broadly composed meter (6/4), which often features the piano playing an identical chord on quarter notes throughout an entire measure. The next most likely cause for complaint has to do with Schumann’s use of a chromatic interlude and postlude that are of equal length (eight measures) and fall rather close to one another (separated by only seven bars). In this instance, the mere proximity of both of the chromatic solo parts for the piano may have occasioned the reviewer’s disapproval. Above all, this complicated harmonic display in “Stille Thränen” is one with which he takes great issue, since he intimates that only a great voice is able to disguise such faults.

Finally, the reviewer’s characterization of the last four songs as “unusual” might have had to do with the fact that “Wer machte dich so krank?” and “Alte Laute” use identical
music. Even though the critic does not address their poetic topics, he might have questioned why Schumann set two different poetic conceits in the same way. He also might have reacted to the smaller scale on which both the final song pair and “Frage,” were written, since these three numbers are of the shortest in op 35.\footnote{“Frage” stands at sixteen measures while “Wer machte dich so krank?” and “Alte Laute” have 28 and 26 measures, respectively. The only song that approaches either of these three in terms of brevity is “Sehnsucht nach der Waldgegend” at 27 measures.} Needless to say, it is still difficult to determine what the reviewer specifically thought about the final song pair.

The reviewer’s relatively benign view of the first volume raises other questions. It is peculiar that the reviewer felt the accompaniment for “Lust der Sturmnacht” to be “suitably wintery,” since that time of year is not specified in the poem, and the composer seems to depict a violent rainstorm in the accompaniment through a preponderance of repeated chords. It seems equally strange that the critic considered “Stirb, Lieb’ und Freud’!” repetitive but not “Wanderlied” (as we shall see at later stages of this chapter, this sentiment is often voiced for the latter song among contemporary scholars).

In general, the reviewer ignores questions of cyclicity and the coherence of the set almost entirely, he questions the composer’s artistic designs, and he praises only a handful of songs. He calls the beauty of many songs into question, even while lauding their conception. Many of the faults the reviewer finds with the songs appears in numbers with more complex musical designs, specifically, “Auf das Trinkglas” and “Stille Thränen.” In both cases, he is averse to complicated harmonic movements and chromatic vocal settings. Instead, he favors designs that are more straightforward, such as the wandering march of “Wanderlied,” and the major/minor contrasts of “Erstes Grün.” While in most cases this reviewer makes relatively few specific observations, we can still gauge some valuable insight into how the cycle was
initially interpreted following the release of the first edition. As we shall see, many of these sentiments persist in early twentieth-century commentaries regarding op. 35.

Further Nineteenth-Century Reviews of op. 35

Critical appraisal of the songs in op. 35 following the initial AmZ review was even less specific, less detailed, and also entailed discussions of only a handful of numbers from the opus. But on the whole, the reception in the short term was no more favorable than the initial notice.

Joseph Wilhelm von Wasielewski, Schumann’s first biographer, speaks briefly about one of the Kerner songs: “Schumann shows great ignorance both in style in manner, when writing for certain voices, as, for example, in No. 2 of Op. 35, and No. 6 of Op. 36. They are written expressly for a “Tenor,” but are far too low for such a voice, and are therefore useless.”6 Although Wasielewski regards “Stirb, Lieb’ und Freud’!” unfavorably, he appears to temper his overall opinion of Schumann as a song composer: “To be sure, he might have won more glorious results, especially in vocal composition, had he gone one step farther, and fulfilled the imperative demands of song as well as studied the pregnant and plastic perfection of melody. In this respect his songs, with but few exceptions, only accidentally such, are unsatisfactory.”7

Songs from op. 35 are mentioned in two articles from the NZfm that otherwise address other genres in which Schumann composed. The article discusses the complete edition of the composer’s works from 1881 and the various inconsistencies between the first edition of the songs and the collected works. One song from op. 35, “Wanderung,” occasions

---


7 Ibid., 132.
specific mention in which the author shows a minor variant (the complete edition sets the pair of sixteenth-notes at the setting of “-te” from “unbekannte” in measure five, individually, instead of beamed together as they are in the first edition). With this example (as well as the many variants he shows between the two editions), the author suggests that it is difficult, and perhaps almost impossible, to assemble a complete and correct edition. In another article in the NZfM on “Der Takt bei Rob. Schumann,” Robert Músiol provides an analysis of the unique ways Schumann used time signatures in his compositions. In the case of Lieder, Músiol points out Schumann’s use of a 4/2 (CC) time signature as one specific only to songs: “Die Löwenbraut,” “Stirb, Lieb’ und Freud’!,” and in op. 65, “Ritornelle,” and “In Meeres Mitten ist ein offner Laden.” He further catalogs Schumann’s use of a 6/4 time signature for both “Sehnsucht nach der Waldgegend” and “Stille Thränen,” noting that this meter was one the composer used quite differently, both in character and rhythmically, from 6/8. Authors in other countries are rather vague in discussing the music and poetry of op. 35. For instance, in a review of an English version of op. 35 (Novello, Ewer and Co.) from 1888, the critic simply lists the numbers, almost like an advertisement, commenting: “They are well known to admirers of Schumann by their German title…the engraving, the printing, and the price are all that could tend to make the issue popular.”

One of the difficulties in following the reception history surrounding op. 35 stems from the lack of public performances (and subsequent reviews of them) in the immediate years following its publication. We have firm dates of premiers for only a handful of songs

---

8 Hermann Reimann, “Schumanniana,” NZfM 15 (13 April 1887), 158.
(see Table 4.1). Alfred Dörffel documents other performances at the Gewandhaus in Leipzig between 1845 and 1881 (when his statistics cease; see Table 4.2).

### Table 4.1: First Public Performances for Songs from op. 35

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Song</th>
<th>Site of Performance</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Lust der Sturmnacht”</td>
<td>Vienna, Saal der Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde</td>
<td>19 February 1862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Wanderlied”</td>
<td>Düsseldorf, Cürtenschen Saal</td>
<td>10 March 1853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Erstes Grün”</td>
<td>Vienna, Saal der Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde</td>
<td>5 December 1858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Stille Liebe”</td>
<td>Leipzig, Saal des Gewandhause</td>
<td>8 December 1844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Stille Thränen”</td>
<td>Berlin, Saal der Sing-Akademie</td>
<td>25 January 1877(^{11})</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 4.2: Gewandhaus Performances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Song</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Lust der Sturmnacht”</td>
<td>1 January 1875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Wanderlied”</td>
<td>6 December 1866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Erstes Grün”</td>
<td>5 October 1871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Sehnsucht nach der Waldgegend”</td>
<td>18 December 1879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Stille Thränen”</td>
<td>27 November 1879(^{12})</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Only isolated songs from op. 35 were performed in public venues immediately following the first edition, and all told, less than half of the songs from the collection were performed in public during this period. We find Clara Schumann and Livia Frege performing “Stille Liebe” along with five other Schumann songs (“An den Sonnenschein,” “Die Nonne,” “Ich grolle nicht,” and “Widmung”) on 8 December 1844 at the Gewandhaus. In addition, the Piano Quartet, op. 47, was also part of the program, along with works by Mendelssohn, Bach, Beethoven, and Chopin. This first public rendition of a number from op. 35 occasioned


just a brief mention in the *AmZ*, noting that it and the other songs were beautiful compositions and were immediately popular to the audience. Although this short synopsis serves as the only available commentary that we have for any early performances of a selection from op. 35, it records quite a different reception from the critic and public than the highly critical *AmZ* review of the printed songs.

It appears, moreover, that no Schumann song cycle was programmed on a concert in its entirety during his lifetime. The listings of the composer’s songs as performed in Gewandhaus recitals show that even cycles with strong narrative threads, such as the Heine *Liederkreis*, op. 24, *Dichterliebe*, and *Frauenliebe und Leben*, were represented by isolated numbers. Only two songs from op. 24, “Schöne Wiege meiner Leiden” and “Mit Myrthen und Rosen,” ever appeared in recitals during this time, all on separate occasions.

If concert performance was limited to individual songs from cycles during Schumann’s lifetime and in the years immediately following his death, this way of programming *Lieder* was not unusual, according to Edward F. Kravitt. During the period of 1830 to 1875, “a few enterprising singers strove to introduce (songs) into the concert hall….” Some, however, did attempt to perform cycles, such as Julius Stockhausen, who was the first to present cycles such as *Dichterliebe* and *Winterreise* in their entirety. According to

---

13 *AmZ* 51 (1844): 869 Much of the commentary for this concert seems rather inconclusive. The author does not discuss any of the individual songs and notes only an overall opinion of their performance (and, after all, only one number from op. 35 was on the program). Much of the review simply notes the talents of the performers and how much the author favored individual pieces.

14 Dörrfel, *Geschichte der Gewandhaus*, 67. *Dichterliebe* and *Frauenliebe und Leben* only received three performances each at the Gewandhaus through 1881.

15 For example, while *Frauenliebe und Leben* received three performances of the entire cycle, five songs from it were programmed on five separate occasions during a period from 1859 to 1879.


17 Ibid.
Kravitt, when Stockhausen decided to present *Die schöne Müllerin* in 1856, the public was perplexed and surprised. This occasioned a response from Eduard Hanslick who noted in his review:

> Indeed Stockhausen bade his public farewell with the simplest program in the world. Instead of the usual jumble of pieces that have no relationship to each other, we read on the poster simply: *Die schöne Müllerin*, a cycle of songs by Franz Schubert. As far as we know, the idea is new; and the concert, which was surprisingly well attended, showed that it was a good idea...The expectation of hearing one of his most fragrant bouquets of songs complete, and not, as is usually the case, as separate flowers each torn from the bouquet, was like a public call to all of Schubert’s followers.\(^\text{18}\)

Obviously, this type of programming seems to be the exception to the rule. More often than not, according to Kravitt, programs during this period were as mixed as they were before 1830, when a typical concert featured a number of unrelated works (such as a movement from a symphony, an aria, an instrumental concerto, and so forth).\(^\text{19}\) The general consensus held that the performance of a cycle would be monotonous. This much is evident in a second review by Hanslick of Stockhausen’s *Die schöne Müllerin* in 1860:

> It is the same experiment that Stockhausen . . . dared to make three years ago and with great success...The public was [then] allowed to view this priceless exhibit in its entirety...to comprehend the work as a dramatic unity. Notwithstanding its advantages, frequent repetition of this experiment is hardly to be recommended: the disadvantages of such a monster concert will stand out grievously as soon as its charm and novelty wear off.\(^\text{20}\)

Kravitt finds it difficult to gauge the enthusiasm for song performances during this period, since there were so few public song recitals during the 1860s: “*Lieder* were then still considered an integral part of *Hausmusik*; and *Liederabende* were seldom encountered in

---


\(^\text{19}\) Ibid., 208.

\(^\text{20}\) Ibid., 210, from Hanslick, *Aus dem Concertsaal*, 214.
concert halls.”21 Kravitt notes that even though Stockhausen received unusual ovations in almost every city he performed Die Schöne Müllerin, most critics from the time seemed “unsympathetic to his “experiment . . . .”22

Not until the later nineteenth-century did Lieder migrate to a public venue—the song recital or Liederabend,—but public interest for these took some time to develop. Kravitt explains that while performances of Liederabende became a great favorite in Vienna from 1876 to 1885, “Many characteristic features of concert life from 1830 to 1875 persisted until about 1900.”23 He shows how many of these concerts not only included songs (concerts in which only Lieder were programmed), but instrumental solos were placed between groups of songs. The height of interest for public Lied performances alone came in the decades between 1900 and 1920 when, “The numerous places where lieder were performed . . . indicate, to some extent, their popularity.” During this time we find that Lieder were frequently programmed not only as a function of various Vereine, but also as an integral genre in concert halls. In the case of the former (musical performances in one’s home or a smaller social venue), this happened for a variety of reasons. First, they fit particularly well into an atmosphere of intimate social gatherings. It also was less expensive to stage song recitals than most other genres. Finally, “it was considered particularly fitting to follow the recitation of a poem (readings of poetry at literary societies were numerous) with a musical setting of it.” For the latter, Kravitt notes that song performances greatly benefited from suggested reforms on concert programming. Further, he relates that critics found it absolutely essential to change the mixed programs that had dominated concerts throughout most of the


22 Ibid.

23 Ibid., 213
nineteenth century. They expressed a desire, moreover, that Lieder recitals should include the works of only one composer, urged that a program have organic unity in choice of works (some even proposed that arias be banned from recitals since “they destroyed the formal unity of lieder programs…”), and presented at least one cycle of songs.⁴

The early history of op. 35 shows that the cycle seems not to have been performed as a whole in public and that the programming of individual songs appears to have been the norm, and this falls directly in line with Kravitt’s commentary. For the most part, this holds true for other cycles from Schumann’s Liederjahr as well. The question, therefore, of whether we today should perform op. 35 as an integral whole, cannot be determined by an historical view of how cycles were treated in Schumann’s time or in the decades immediately following his death.

**Early Twentieth-Century Reception**

Some twentieth-century authors still maintained that Lieder belonged in the home: “I consider it barbarous to drag into our giant modern concert halls string quartets, sonatas, for one or two instruments, and Gesänge with piano accompaniment… These forms are, in the noblest sense of the word, Hausmusik and should be heard only at informal gathering . . .”⁵ One new way that op. 35 made its way into the home at the beginning of the twentieth-century appears in catalogs of early recordings of Schumann’s music. In his article on this, Thomas Synofzik documents all of the early known recordings of Schumann’s music from 1898 to 1909.⁶ Synofzik’s list reveals 141 recordings from this time, 132 of them

---

⁴ The preceding account of the Lied in public concert appears in Ibid., 213-16.


representing songs. Among the repertoire of songs selected for recording, we find some very revealing choices. From op. 35, only three songs appear: “Wanderlied,” with fourteen separate recordings, and “Wer machte dich so krank?” and “Alte Laute,” which occasioned one recording each. As noted previously, “Wanderlied” was among the only settings that received praise from the initial AmZ review (perhaps due to its declamatory setting and status as a wandering folksong, as I discussed above). We might suppose that singers (or artistic directors) from this time also valued these same qualities in “Wanderlied,” as evidenced by its frequency on disks.

By way of comparison, four other cycles from Schumann’s Liederjahr show greater favor in the variety of numbers selected for recording. In the case of Dichterliebe, seven different songs from the cycle were recorded, and “Ich grolle nicht” was the favorite by far, with twelve individual recordings. Six different songs were also recorded from op. 25 (“Widmung” standing as the favorite, with eight recordings), as well as four songs from op. 39. Finally, while Frauenliebe und Leben only had a total of two individual songs recorded, it stands as the only cycle featured in its entirety. In the end, only one cycle, op. 24, would receive less attention from singers than op. 35’s one number, since “Mit Myrthen und Rosen” represents the only recording from the Heine Liederkreis.

Synofzik’s list of these early recordings not only shows the immense popularity of selected numbers from Schumann’s cycles, but also the regard in which certain cycles were held. We find a broad selection of numbers for several cycles and even one that was recorded

---

27 The other selections are all instrumental. Seven of them are an arrangement of Träumerei for piano and either violin or cello. The remaining two are an orchestral arrangement of “Die beiden Grenadiere” and an arrangement for piano and violin of Gartenmelodie, op. 85 no. 3.

28 Ibid., 146-51.

29 Ibid., 149.
complete. Although “Wanderlied” represents the most frequently recorded song by Schumann during this time, it appears that there was not much esteem for the rest of the cycle, since so few of the remaining numbers of op. 35 attracted attention from singers. And during the rest of the twentieth-century, the cycle continued to garner little attention, save for a few numbers.

Just as in nineteenth-century, we find similar difficulties deriving information about the Liederreihe by scholarly or journalistic crowds before the end of World War II. Much of the scholarly commentary about op. 35 before World War II is very imprecise, since the vast majority of writers discuss only individual numbers, and we find almost no discussion of cyclicity in either its poetry or music. Furthermore, songs from op. 35 do not receive the same attention from critics as those from Dichterliebe and Frauenliebe und Leben, whose individual numbers are discussed the most by far. This is not to say that the Kerner songs are not addressed, however. For instance, Ernst Wolff briefly notes “Stille Thränen” among two other songs, “Widmung” and “Schöne Wiege meiner Leiden,” as works that show Schumann ignoring the physical and technical limitations of the human voice. Although Wolff does not explain why “Stille Thränen” falls into this category, we might surmise that he found its especially broad range difficult for a singer. Some authors such as Ernst Challier-Giessen acknowledge the Kerner songs as part of Schumann’s output from 1840, but they do not go any further in explaining poetic themes in the cycle, or any of its particular musical aspects. Others, such as Hermann Bischoff, offer commentaries that laud individual numbers such as

30 The only exception to this that we find is a song by song analysis of Frauenliebe und Leben that addresses both poetry and music for the entire cycle. See Eva Siegfried, “Robert Schumanns Frauenliebe un-Leben,” NZfM 25 (17 June 1903), 354-57.


“Wanderlied” but do not necessarily provide any further insight as to what they specifically valued in a song. Bischoff writes in 1926, “Here the artist is unmistakably inspired through the poet and [Schumann] gives a bright gaze into the poetry—not with shut eyes but with the essence of the poetry in mind.”33

Although writers from this time rarely discuss the poetic content of op. 35, Hermann Abert addresses this matter and how what Schumann might have been drawn to in Kerner’s poetry. He writes:

A further look into Schumann’s lyrical capabilities is shown in Byron’s and Robert Burns’s poetry. The world-weary singer and the longing for the supernatural, the latter in stark contrast to his treatment of folk poetry, are each capable of Schumann’s muse. This notion is also apparent in Justinus Kerner, whose poetry also exhibits a curious blend between pure folk sentimentality and melancholy. Schumann deals with this curious poetic idea the best in the Liederreihe op. 35, in number four [“Wanderlied”], where one finds these sentiments distinct.34

Although Abert only mentions one song from op. 35, he is among the first writers to acknowledge poetic elements not only specific to this song, but also those that distinguish many of the other numbers from the Liederreihe: sentimentality and sadness. Moreover, he recognizes the essence of the wanderer that lies at the heart of the narrative of op. 35.

Other writers around this same time parallel German authors in their preferences for certain song cycles, and their inattention to cyclicity in favor of addressing songs individually. We find a perfect example of this in a series of song translations by Ernest Walker in Music and Letters published in three separate issues throughout 1922: only certain numbers from op. 24, op. 25, op. 35, and op. 39 appear (and most of the selected translations

33 Hermann Bischoff, Das Deutsche Lied (Berlin, 1926), 53.
34 Hermann Abert, Robert Schumann (Berlin 1903), 71.
from these cycles are not grouped together, but spread across separate issues). The major exception to this comes in Dichterliebe, where all sixteen songs from the cycle appear together in one journal. Nonetheless, Walker presents a handful of numbers from op. 35 in his analysis of structure in Schumann’s songs, where we find an immediate parallel between his discussion and Hermann Abert’s in comparing Schumann’s setting of Kerner to Burns. In this sense, however, Walker is concerned with song forms, and uses “Hauptmanns Weib,” (op. 25, no. 19) and “Auf das Trinkglas eines verstorbenen Freundes” as examples. In addition to both songs being “alike in [their] imaginativeness and…unusual and very rounded design,” he notes that they are more flexible in their structure compared to Schumann’s tendency to compose songs sectionally, with fairly constant recurrence. Walker further concerns himself with the composer’s use of piano postludes in songs, and gives us a general sense of what he valued in two numbers from op. 35. For “Wanderlied,” he classifies it among Schumann’s songs that “give just the right finish to the whole…[with its] jolly tramping at the end….” But in the case of “Stille Thränen,” regards its ending as an afterthought that outstays its welcome. Even though the postlude in “Wanderlied” is longer in measure count (nine measures compared to seven for “Stille Thränen”), Walker reacts to the timing of each ending determined by its tempo. In “Stille Thränen” the 6/4 time signature

35 The following translations come from Ernest Walker, “Song Translations: The Songs of Schumann and Brahms: Some Contacts and Contrasts,” Music and Letters 3 (1922), 9-19: op 24 (nos. 6,8); op. 25 (nos. 5, 7, 24); op. 35 (nos. 3, 4); and op. 39 (nos. 5, 12). The next two issues of the journal feature translations (by multiple individuals) from other songs in those same cycles: op. 24 (no. 7); op. 25 (no. 3); and op. 35 (no. 10) in Music and Letters 3 (1922), 206-08 and 305-09.

36 Ibid., 307-09.

37 Ibid., 11.

38 Ibid., 12.
and “Sehr langsam” tempo suggestion produces a much broader and drawn-out postlude than that of “Wanderlied,” written in 4/4 and with a tempo indication of “Sehr lebhaft.”

Post World War II Reception of the Liederreihe

Although reviews of op. 35 before WWII do not evince much interest in its component songs or necessarily consider issues of cyclicity, a handful of scholars and performers began to address this matter in the latter half of twentieth-century. They begin to discuss the collection’s poetic themes, then pay increasing attention to the significance of the work as a cycle, and more recently musicologists have taken into account closer readings of its harmonic and tonal schemes as well as its compositional history. At first the vast majority of post WWII scholars seem to have used the first complete edition of Schumann’s works (1881-1893) as the basis for their discussion. Only later did more systematic research begin to examine the genesis of the opus and Schumann’s other Kerner songs in detail.

Karl Wörner and Martin Cooper are the two initial writers who specifically address Kerner as a poet and offer some of the first commentaries on Schumann’s affection for his poetry. Wörner notes Schumann’s affinity for setting Kerner, citing the composer’s “especially fond affiliation for the poet’s genuineness of emotion, nature rooted in the senses of life, and the calming force of experience.”39 Cooper offers a far different assessment, especially in the case of “Wer machte dich so krank?” and “Alte Laute” where “the mystery behind the poems is objectively imagined rather than subjectively experienced. This accounts for the tame ending of Alte Laute…” 40 Cooper offers a similar response to both Schumann’s treatment of “Stille Thränen” and its poetry, noting that “It lacks entirely the drive and bite that Heine’s sense of humour and power of self-criticism give to even his most effusive


poems; and Schumann’s music, for all the beauty of the melody and the richness and subtlety of the modulations, is too discursive and rambling.”

Both Wörner and Cooper are also among the first to consider how the songs relate to one another on a broader scale. In Cooper this notion is relatively limited: he presents the final two numbers from op. 35 as a pair. Wörner addresses the *Liederreihe* as a whole, giving a song-by-song synopsis of its poetic elements, showing how Schumann arranged the progression of the poetry into a novella (a distinction, as we shall see, that is later echoed in Dietrich Fischer-Dieskau’s book). Both Wörner and Hans Moser find it significant that Schumann ultimately labeled op. 35 a *Liederreihe* instead of a *Liederkreis*. Wörner’s account makes a compelling case for cyclicity, not only by outlining a narrative track from song to song, but also by illustrating contrasts between adjacent songs, both in their music and text, showing how the persona’s experiences continually change. For example, “Lust der Sturmnacht” leads to an entirely new world in “Stirb, Lieb’ und Freud’!” that is immediately evident in the churchlike atmosphere established by the accompaniment. Another contrast follows in the form of upheaval in “Wanderlied,” where the persona leaves his homeland, which is followed by another different atmosphere of melancholy and resignation in “Erstes Grün.” For Wörner, the progression of the poetry in op. 35 follows this pattern of contrast and reversal, and although he points out that most of Schumann’s settings are distinctive, he still traces an overall development of a narrative.

Authors from this point on increasingly began to address matters of cyclicity for op. 35 in light of Schumann’s other notable song cycles from 1840. Gerald Moore offers an assessment of op. 35 in *Poet’s Love: The Songs and Cycles of Schumann*—a work that

---

41 Ibid.
reflects a point of view just before and just after World War II. But oddly, Moore does not present op. 35 as a whole; rather, he separates “Wanderlied” and “Erstes Grün” in a chapter of “Songs from Ausgewählte Lieder” and discusses the rest in a later chapter entitled “A Miscellany of Songs.” Thus his ultimate conclusion presents a notion indicative of an earlier and freer performance practice: “When urging the artist to sing these twelve Kerner songs as a group, I feel there is nothing to prevent him presenting them in any order he pleases.” Moreover, “The fact that these songs are under one opus does not make them a Liederkreis as is the Heine op. 24 . . . .” This sentiment arises from the author’s notion that one “might find this last song pair too limp for a finale.” Therefore, he suggests they might be inserted after “Frage” to make “the noble music of “Stille Thränen” bring the group to a conclusion.”

Moore’s suggestion to use “Stille Thränen” as the closing number to op. 35 offers a change in attitude, nevertheless, from the nineteenth century review that regarded the song as “tuneless.” Moore discusses no other song from the group in as much detail or with such praise: “So massive is the texture of the song and so noble the music that if there were no words and the melody were played by a violin or a violoncello one could feel it as an expression of ecstasy.” Furthermore, “Justinus Kerner might find that the music is not a reflection of his current of thought. This may be so but, in the opinion of the writer, it is an opulent and soul-searching creation.” On one hand, “Stille Thränen” may offer a more demonstrative conclusion musically. It stands as one of Schumann’s most demanding settings vocally due to its broad range, its chromatic palette reflects the persona’s angst of his jilted

---

42 Even though Moore’s book was published after authors such as Eric Sams and Stephen Walsh, his work seems to summarize a point of view that reflects an earlier experience: he retired from the concert stage in 1967 (born 1899).


44 Ibid., 156.

45 Ibid., 158.
love, and the postlude in the piano offers no surcease. But this would have created a tonally ambiguous conclusion to mirror the end of the wanderer’s travels, and if one were to place “Wer machte dich so krank?” and “Alte Laute” after “Frage,” any semblance of the narrative trajectory derived from the preceding songs would be lost.

Eric Sams’s *The Songs of Robert Schumann* (first published in 1969) still echoes some nineteenth-century views about the individual songs of op. 35. Sams discusses all fourteen of the Kerner texts Schumann set at the end of 1840, since he includes “Sängers Trost” and “Trost im Gesang” as part of his commentary (due to the fact that he organized his book by what he supposed was the chronology of composition for each of the *Lied*). He also addresses Schumann’s fondness for Kerner by noting, “It was the poetry of Justinus Kerner, with its overtones of mysticism and tragedy, that had drawn from the seventeen-year old Schumann his first songs. So it was natural that at the height of his song-writing powers, in May 1840, he should think of Kerner again . . . .” Sams takes a step towards acknowledging the whole of op. 35 when he characterizes the collection as a “love-song-cycle” in Schumann’s more mature style, and accordingly, he feels that the most memorable songs from it are “on the whole those with some element of drama or conflict,” with “Lust der Sturmnacht,” “Stirb’ Lieb und Freud’!,” and “Auf das Trinkglas eines verstorbenen Freundes” as prime examples. And as he does with the Heine and Eichendorff *Liederkreis, Myrthen*, and *Dichterliebe*, Sams notes the key sequence of op. 35, asserting that “Frage” functions as a structural link for the cycle, a notion Turchin would echo later.

While Sams admits the significance of the overall tonal scheme of op. 35, he does not find a narrative design: “The selection of poems hints at a story of lost love and separation.

---

But the verse, acceptable though much of it is, will not stand this treatment; not even Schumann’s art can make a unity out of this material.”47 This sentiment appears in his initial comments about the title of the work: “This group is interestingly titled Eine Liederreihe a row or series of songs, as distinct from the previous Zyklus or Kreis, a cycle or circle, as if to confirm that the music is now open-ended.”48 Regardless, many of his commentaries regarding the poetry and text settings do tend to see the collection as a whole and suggests that Schumann actually ordered his selections of Kerner’s verse. For example, he notes about “Lust der Sturmnacht” that Schumann’s aim for the music and poetry are alike in that “sorrow and love, life and death, are illuminated from within the music by one continuous light.”49 We find further examples of this in his assessment of “Erstes Grün,” where he intimates: “The poem contrasts human debility with the restoring freshness that dwells deep down in nature. Schumann contrasts a melancholy minor song-music with a joyous vision of springtime in the major piano interludes. In the result the words and their music are at different stages of recuperation.”50

Although Sams offers some praise for Schumann’s settings, he notes some specific deficiencies in them, for instance in “Wanderlied,” that reverse the nineteenth- and early twentieth-century view of it was one of the most successful songs in the group: “The words, like those of his other attempts to in the folksong vein, are better known to a different tune. The main theme comes at least once too often, the final repetition is unimpressive, the

47 Ibid.


49 Sams, Songs of Robert Schumann, 167.

50 Ibid., 170.
transition is too weak, the music is derivative from earlier and better songs.” ⁵¹ And of the final song pair he notes, “The same melody is used for two different poems simply to echo a soft slow music with something even softer and slower…But the two poems have nothing in common save that they are metrically analogous, and maudlin; and in this effect, rather than any sense of finality, is what the music achieves.” ⁵²

About the two omitted songs, Sams hypothesizes that both “Sängers Trost” and “Trost im Gesang” were left out of op. 35 because they were derivative of other Kerner songs, especially the prelude of the former with “Sehnsucht nach der Waldgegend.” For the latter song, he notes that the poem’s “pedestrian metaphor [that] deserves a similar setting...In the result the music is unconvincing; it conveys not so much a real comfort, as to resolve to march up and down and sing to show that it is not afraid.” ⁵³

Even though Sams seems to acknowledge the integrity of collection as a whole, much of his commentary parallels what we find in the nineteenth-century AmZ review of op. 35, because he treats each of the songs individually. However, he does move away from the nineteenth-century stance by offering some hint of a narrative, and he treats the songs as a cycle (in particular, with his comment about the weak ending for the songs). Although he dismisses the possibility of Schumann making Kerner’s poems cohere, his own analysis paradoxically reveals several distinct possibilities for how one might arrive at an overall narrative. This is most evident in how he attempts to make sense out of the title Liederreihe for the opus in considering it “open-ended” rather than a Zyklus.

⁵¹ Ibid., 169.
⁵² Ibid., 176.
⁵³ Ibid., 177-78.
Stephen Walsh, just a few years after Sams, repeats many of Moore’s sentiments and all but dismisses the idea of op. 35 being a cycle by questioning the very manner in which Schumann selected its poetry. He suggests that “Schumann apparently chose [Kerner’s texts] more or less at random.”\textsuperscript{54} Much like Sams, Walsh offers some criticism of the songs and summarizes them as, “settings (which) include conventional lyrics of a pessimistic cast, alongside veiled epigrams such as ‘Wer machte dich so krank?’ bold drinking and marching-songs of an aspiring nature, and even one near-ballad. Even the songs finally included in the \textit{Zwölf Gedichte}, op. 35, have no perceptible pattern, and vary considerably in both scale and manner, though we have the evidence of a sometimes laborious coherent key sequence to show that the composer intended some higher unity beyond the superficial contrasts.”\textsuperscript{55} For example, Walsh uses the instance where “Stirb, Lieb’ und Freud’!” ends in the dominant of F minor and is followed by “Wanderlied” on a unison F (the dominant of its own key, B flat): “Apart from a superficial resemblance in the idea of parting or separation, there is no other connection between either songs or their poems.”\textsuperscript{56} This opinion also applies to the final four songs of op. 35 which reveal “no clear thread of meaning, except perhaps the idea of nature consoling human grief, and this is in any case contradicted by the final poem, ‘Alte Laute’, where even the flowers and birdsong have lost their power to heal.”\textsuperscript{57}

For Walsh, part of the problem with op. 35 has to do with the context of other cycles by the composer from the same period: “The effect on Schumann’s lyrical writing of his recent ventures into a more dramatic style is to make it bolder and more muscular, sometimes
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to the point of grandiloquence, especially when the verse itself has lofty pretensions. Thus few of the Kerner songs evince that subtle feeling of things unsaid which is such a feature of the Heine and Eichendorff songs."^58 Walsh finds this when comparing “Lust der Sturmnacht” with “Schöne Fremde” from op. 39, “to see how explicit statement has replaced implied suggestion.”^59 Although Walsh’s commentary dismisses the idea of op. 35 as cycle from a narrative standpoint, he seems to at least acknowledge a basic key structure for it. His opinion of the songs thus depends more on their narrative design and the manner by which Schumann created the individual numbers.

While some of the previous authors seem to downplay op. 35 as a cycle, Dietrich Fischer-Dieskau (or whoever served as his ghost writer) offers a much different perspective in Robert Schumann. Words and Music. Fischer-Dieskau is one of the first to consider op. 35 as an inseparable whole, at least as a narrative. He begins by explaining: “One discovers from these Kerner songs that Schumann looked for more in a poem than attractive formal design. None of these poems speak of joy or contentment but rather with dramatic force of sadness, loneliness, sacrifice and madness. But even as the voice rises to express intense emotion, a feeling of failure, of not knowing what to do, intervenes.” Fischer-Dieskau further asserts a narrative description for the songs previously intimated but left unexplored by Karl Wörner: “Schumann managed to combine Kerner’s individual poems into a unified whole. The indication “Novelle” … may have guided the composer. Realizing that the songs were related to each other in subtle ways, Schumann referred to them as a Liederreihe (group)

^58 Ibid.

^59 Ibid., 68.
rather than *Liederkreis* (cycle).” 60

In addition to being the first modern commentator to examine the first edition of op. 35, Fischer-Dieskau also addresses matters of performance instructions, for example, in “Stirb, Lieb’ und Freud’!” While we noted an early sentiment about this song from Wasielewski that questioned Schumann’s indication for a tenor, Fischer-Dieskau explains the importance of Schumann’s preference for this voice resulted from the difficulty of a baritone producing the highest notes softly. 61 Furthermore, he considers some of the structural links between songs, such as the half-cadence at the conclusion of “Frage” leading into “Stille Thränen,” as an indication of intended cyclicity. And he considers Schumann wise to omit “Sängers Trost,” since “it is unlikely that the rather pedantic poem would have resulted in anything but third-rate music.” 62

While previous authors questioned the final song pair for op. 35, Fischer-Dieskau notes the absence of a conventional, effective conclusion, but that the “pianissimo ending of *Alte Laute*…is not all that different from *Leiermann* which concludes Schubert’s *Winterreise.*” The conclusion of op. 35 was not intended to create a dramatic effect, but rather to establish, “a connection [between two songs] that was sufficiently gentle to make possible the “Noch langsamer und leiser” (even slower and more softly) of *Alte Laute.*” 63 Fischer-Dieskau continues:

> Nothing could be more delicate than this “double song” which never stoops to sentimentality. Its inner glow is hidden under a deceptively cold surface. Schumann’s

---


61 Ibid., 109.

62 Ibid., 112. Even though Schumann eventually published “Sängers Trost,” Fischer-Dieskau offers no further analysis of the song, or why he regards it third-rate.

63 Ibid., 111.
longing for a world full of light and happiness finds expression here—painful longing, for such a world was moving farther and farther beyond his reach. Such emotions account for new stylistic qualities in his music: frequent use of altered chords, chromatic lines, and passages with long, insistent crescendos. These may seem daring to the unprepared listener, but they are musical manifestations of the composer’s inner life. His harmonies suggest; drawn out suspensions tend to cloud the voice leading. Such tense harmonies remind one of a face distorted by pain. Lonesome and from a distance the composer gazes upon the busy world.64

Even though much of Fischer-Dieskau’s analysis of op. 35 follows this same sentimental bent, the passage above offers some practical conclusions about the cycle. The similarity he notes between “Alte Laute” and Schubert’s “Der Leiermann” links both cycles to genre of wayfaring cycles. At first glance, it appears that Fischer-Dieskau only considered how the songs might relate in a musical sense, not poetically. Both function in comparable ways musically: similar dynamics, sparse piano textures, a lamentory text setting, and slow tempi. But Fischer-Dieskau may imply that both texts are similar in their conclusions for the respective cycles. In Winterreise, the end of the traveler’s journey marks a point in which the persona encounters the organ grinder who plays tunes and no one wants to hear him or behold him. The persona then asks a rhetorical question: shall he go with the old man (a personification of death)? In this way the traveler suggests the possibility of death as his fate; but we never discover the outcome of the story. Similarly, at the conclusion of op. 35 the persona suggests death as the only cure to his troubling dream, but we never discover whether he actually dies in the end.

August Gerstmeier, writing just after Fischer-Dieskau, provides one of the first close theoretical examinations of an individual song in op. 35, “Sehnsucht nach der Waldgegend.” Gerstmeier feels that Schumann grounds his setting of the initial stanza in the simplicity of a

64 Ibid., 112.
folsong, which supplies the entire layout. But this is not to say that some peculiarities do not exist in how Schumann declaimed its text. Even though Kerner’s verse is very straightforward, Gerstmeier notes the unusual way Schumann sets the first quatrain, where he distributes four lines over six measures (see ex. 4.1 above). Gerstmeier also notes how the accompaniment runs against the melodic line in two ways. In Example 4.1, the line “Wär ich nie” does not begin on a downbeat with the piano. Thus, it is immediately given special significance because it is offset from the arpeggiated piano part. The piano provides a sense of agitation in its rhythmic content since certain beats in the arpeggios are sustained as quarter and half notes, providing a sense of syncopation against the voice.


---

65 August Gerstmeier, Die Lieder Schumanns (Tutzing, 1982), 130.

66 Ibid.

67 Ibid., 132
Revisionist Views of op. 35

If Barbara Turchin sums up much of the previous diverse modern reception of the Kerner Liederreihe we have seen that op. 35 has recently started to receive greater attention from scholars, even though some questioned its status among Schumann’s other notable song cycles. A growing esteem for the cycle has continued, as several current authors in the past twenty years have attempted to identify the various ways op. 35 operates as a cycle, how its poetry and music work in tandem, and finally, how its compositional history affects its status as a cohesive “work.” Turchin’s analysis of op. 35 was of the first to suggest how examples of melodic and harmonic integration between songs might create more than a random assortment of Lieder and how the opus falls in a context of a Wanderlieder tradition.68 This marked the beginning of a trend in which several current scholars have tried to interpret op. 35 on the basis of its poetic content, and also how coherence might be discovered through an analysis of the collection’s compositional stages.

Heinz Rölleke goes one step further beyond Turchin’s work by citing the entries in TbIII that coincide with op. 35’s composition, and also by analyzing Schumann’s early interest in Kerner’s poetry. Rölleke believes Schumann found in Kerner a type of “Wunderhorn-Klang” and a specific tone in his poetry that was much like that of Goethe’s “rapture of melancholy” (Wonne der Wehmut), citing “Stirb, Lieb’ und Freud’!,” “Stille Thränen,” “Wer machte dich so krank?,” “Alte Laute,” and “Trost im Gesang.” The combination of wine, sadness, dying, and nature in “Auf das Trinkglas eines verstorbenen Freundes” parallels the other themes in the collection, and these elements also surface in the

---

68 Eric Sams and Fischer-Dieskau both acknowledge the possibility of op. 35 as something more than a random assortment of Lieder (see Walsh and Moore); however, Turchin’s work is the first to provide tangible examples from both the music and text to show what Schumann might have had in mind.
folkloric “Wanderlied,” with its themes of melancholy and parting. Rölleke claims further that what appealed to Schumann about Kerner was the sadness and a longing for death the poetry encompasses. Schumann (according to Rölleke) felt a kinship with this on the whole because it derived from the spirit of Romanticism and thus, found its way into the composer’s works. To illustrate this, Rölleke uses a poem by Kerner from 1834 copied into the *Abschriften verschiedener Gedichte zur Composition* from by Clara titled *Wanderer in der Sägmühle*. Kerner’s text depicts a traveler who comes upon a sawmill and sees an evergreen, as if from a dream. The tree is alive but a funeral melody came to him that pierced his heart, in the scream of the saws from within as the timber ground through the mill. He then sees his tree processed, and his heart sinks as the wheel stops turning. Rölleke feels that this poem speaks to a common theme found in Kerner’s poetry: a strong sense of mortal finality—death proves the only possible outcome. This conclusion stands in stark contrast to Eichendorff’s poetry, which always remained very uplifting and vibrant. But this according to Rölleke is not the case with Kerner. As we have discovered in op. 35, death is alluded to at various points in the cycle, and becomes particularly apparent in the last two songs. This begins with a disturbance for the persona in “Wer machte dich so krank?” and ends bleakly in the last strophe of “Alte Laute,” where death is suggested as the final outcome.

While Rölleke is concerned with musical style and meaning in op. 35, Hans Joachim Köhler offers a very brief but insightful commentary on narrative coherence in op. 35 by investigating the nature of it as a cycle through its compositional history and subsequent

---


70 Ibid., 56.

71 This poem was only copied into this volume and was never set by either Robert or Clara.
narrative. One of the compelling notions from Köhler’s article is his assertion that some of the Kerner texts were chosen as responses to those Schumann set in the first compositional phase. Köhler details all three compositional phases of the cycle according to their recorded dates in both *TbIII* and *LbIII* and also any subsequent commentary about the songs that Schumann and Clara entered into their joint dairy. All of this is taken into account with respect to the order of the songs as they appear in two volumes of the first edition as some of the reasons why Schumann might have proceeded beyond the six songs he initially planned as a cycle.

Köhler specifically addresses the title of op. 35, and suggests that although Schumann had the final word in calling op. 35 a *Liederreihe*, there is still some debate as to how one might interpret this, due to the fact that the term was unknown even at the time. Though some previous writers such as Fischer-Dieskau described the *Liederreihe* label as apropos, Köhler’s sentiment is one that still prevails among some present-day scholars. Köhler’s solution to understanding op. 35’s title better mirrors an earlier sentiment we found with Wörner, in assessing the various poetic relationships between adjacent numbers that on the surface, seem quite different: can we find correlations between the sadness of “Stirb, Lieb’ und Freud’!” and the drinking song that follows in “Wanderlied”? And what are we to make of the disparity between the theme of mysticism we find in “Auf das Trinkglas eines verstorbenen Freundes” and traveling march of “Wanderung”? While there might be

---

72 See Hans Joachim Köhler, “Schumanns Kerner-Lieder op. 35,” *Schumann und seine Dichter*, ed. Matthias Wendt (Mainz, 1993), 88-89. The tables he provides for the songs closely resemble those I produced in Chapter one. There is one major exception, however. Köhler places “Erstes Grün” in the final compositional phase rather than the second. He indicates that the date of composition for the song as 17.12 40. This appears to be a mistake on his behalf. Schumann very clearly indicates in *LbIII* that the date of composition is 7 December 1840 which would also make it the first song composed from that month and as a result, part of the second group of Kerner texts the composer set.

difficulty in judging how poetic relationships work from one song to the next, Köhler takes this one step further by suggesting Schumann’s setting of the poems contain certain hidden meanings and a determinable psychological plot. Köhler asks further, could it be that the songs are not part of a cycle sequence, per se, but an expressive chain of ideas and thoughts that are only understood when heard. Thus, if one takes this into account, it is possible then to see how some of these elements just might come together.\textsuperscript{74}

While writers such as Eric Frederick Jensen question the narrative conventions of op. 35 as a cycle (a sentiment we previously noted with Gerald Moore and Stephen Walsh),\textsuperscript{75} John Daverio presents a different perspective. First, Daverio qualifies op. 35 as one of Schumann’s song cycles by listing it among nine other sets of songs from the composer’s \textit{Liederjahr} that cohere both textually and musically. Daverio, following Turchin, not only places the \textit{Liederreihe} within the context of \textit{Wanderlieder}, but also offers op.35, along with \textit{Dichterliebe} and \textit{Frauenliebe und Leben}, as works that “confirm the power of memory itself, a theme that, perhaps more than any other, bring us to the heart of Schumann’s role as a musical poet”\textsuperscript{76} For Daverio the notion of memory plays a decisive role in understanding poetic conceits in op. 35 through Schumann’s use of thematic recall in the final song pair. The recollection of “Wer machte dich so krank’s” folk-song in “Alte Laute” softens the blow of the wanderer’s troubling dream from which only an angel can awaken him. Even though he is resigned to death he can still take some comfort from the memory of tunes from his youth.\textsuperscript{77}

\textsuperscript{74} Ibid., 88

\textsuperscript{75} Eric Frederick Jensen, \textit{Schumann} (New York, 2001), 194.


\textsuperscript{77} Ibid., 216.
Although Daverio’s interpretation of the cycle’s conclusion alludes to previous readings of the main poetic conceit (nostalgia) in the *Liederreihe*, there might be some question whether thematic recall truly “softens the blow” of the wanderer’s fate. As we saw in Chapter 1, the connection between songs of wayfaring and nostalgia (with its etymological roots in homesickness), guides the path of the persona as he leaves his homeland, prompted by unrequited love. And while the old sounds from his youth may offer him some comfort in “Alte Laute” as Daverio suggests, it remains unclear whether the persona finds consolation: once his hopes are disappointed, death offers the only respite from his sad dream.

Daverio also uses a song from op. 35 to show how Schumann’s use of piano postludes complete thoughts only partially articulated by the voice. In the case of “Stille Thränen,” the accompanimental postlude continues a narrative idea: as the wanderer awakens and sets forth again, his longing for union with the natural expanse around him is underscored at the final melodic cadence in the voice (on the tonic, C) with a deceptive cadence in the piano. According to Daverio, this instrumental melody, which symbolizes nature, has the last word. ⁷⁸ While he certainly offers a reasonable analysis of how Schumann treats the persona’s final sentiment in “Stille Thränen,” this gesture might extend even further. In Chapter 3 I questioned whether nature has truly eased the wanderer’s suffering and came to the conclusion that his longing for consolation in nature provides no solace. However we regard this interpretation or that from Daverio, the important point remains that he takes op. 35 seriously as a cycle (reflecting the scholarly work recently done before him), and he, like other authors, regards the “rapture of melancholy” as one of the features that most attracted Schumann to Kerner’s verse.

---

⁷⁸ Ibid., 207.
Hartmut Krones offers a recent examination of op. 35 that echoes many of the same sentiments voiced by Rölleke and also Hans Joachim Köhler. Krones suggests that Schumann was enchanted with Kerner’s poetry and that the twelve songs represent a wide variety of topics, including the pain of love, songs of memory, inspiration in nature, and wandering. These are all articulated at various points throughout the cycle and are highlighted by “Stille Thränen,” which he finds the saddest song of the cycle. He also suggests that it seems closest to the Schubertian tradition because it presents an awkward truth so seriously, and not in an unreal manner.

One of the important aspects to Krones’s work is found in his commentary on how we might view the cycle according to the way the songs fall in the initial volume of the first edition. He notes that the first five songs illuminate themes of renunciation and alienation, the pain of love, as well as pleasure in nature. The second volume shows a break from the latter with subjects of spiritual pain and death in the end. Essentially, the first two songs set the stage from which we might see this interplay between life and death. In “Lust der Stürmnacht,” the “bipolar tonality” sets the stage for the ways death and bliss are depicted. Appropriately, “Stirb, Lieb und Freud’!” follows with its tragically unfulfilled love. This surfaces next in the folksong “Wanderlied,” where the romantic notion of traveling stands in stark contrast to the elegiac complexity of “Erstes Grün.” The middle portion of this song sets up the ultimate heartfelt meaning in “Sehnsucht nach der Waldgegend,” which resembles
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Eichendorff’s manner of fading away into oblivion. Thus, it appears that a type of “back and forth” pattern guides the narrative design of the songs in the first volume.

While Krones’s view of the songs as they fall in the first volume offers a perspective of the largely overlooked first edition, we must remember that this may not have been Schumann’s original design for op. 35 (see Chapter 3). Furthermore, he assumes that the composer had planned the two uneven volumes by narrative design, as opposed to imagining to what could have been the logistics of publication (as we have previously discussed). Thus, the ways in which he identifies the progression of subjects (that Schumann ordered them to follow a juxtaposed course), and their narrative break at the beginning of the second volume, bears questioning.

Hans-Udo Kreuels offers an entire volume dedicated to both op. 35 and ten other Kerner songs by Schumann, though he works only from the complete edition of the texts, ignoring compositional process in the piano drafts and alterations for the first edition entirely. His work provides a biographical sketch of Kerner, phases of composition as they appear from their dates in TbIII (but not LbIII), and a review of each individual poem as well as an analysis of the manner by which Schumann declaimed them. Kreuels echoes an idea from Fischer-Dieskau in his analysis of “Stirb, Lieb’ und Freud’!,” where he shows how Schumann might have been influenced by the final chorus from J.S. Bach’s St. John Passion with “Herr Jesus Christ, eröre mich, eröre mich!” For Kreuels, the descending line of the

83 Ibid.
84 Hans-Udo Kreuels. Schumanns Kerner-Lieder: Interpretation und Analyse sämtlicher Lieder Robert Schumanns nach Gedichten von Jusinus Kerner mit Berücksichtigung der Liedereihe op. 35 (Frankfurt, 2003), 15. Kreuels does not actually cite any source specifically (he only mentions TbIII in passing) as the basis for his dates.
soprano played a role in how Schumann proceeded to set lines such as “O Jungfrau rein!”\textsuperscript{85} Although we cannot state with certainty whether Schumann intended to reproduce this gesture from Bach, both share a similar pattern in their melodic design and also in how Schumann mirrors the use of the fermata by Bach with “weih’t” and “Maid” on whole notes (see exx. 4.2-4.3).

Example 4.2: Piano reduction of “Herr Jesus Christ, erhöre mich, erhöre mich!”\textsuperscript{86}


Kreuels also suggests that the narrative design follows in the same “back and forth” manner as suggested earlier by Krones and Rölleke. But he takes this one step further: he charts a path from which we might view the narrative progression with specific themes

\textsuperscript{85} Dietrich Fischer-Dieskau also states that this is a possibility: “A sequence of descending steps for the nun’s exclamation is based on the final chorus from Bach’s \textit{St. John Passion}.” From Fischer-Dieskau, \textit{Robert Schumann}, 109.

\textsuperscript{86} Kreuels, \textit{Schumanns Kerner-Lieder}, 23.
generated from the poetry (see Table 4.3). Although Kreuels offers a reading of op. 35 by producing a psychological progression for the songs, some of his labels may go a bit far—the implication of “hubris” in “Lust der Sturmnacht” seems to overstate the case, even though the persona does intimate that amid the howling of the storm outside, he remains safe inside. If anything, the persona seems humbled by his surroundings and seems indebted to his beloved for a respite from the violent storm.

Table 4.3: Narrative Themes from op. 35

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hypothesis: “Lust der Sturmnacht” (Hubris)</th>
<th>Compensation II: “Wanderung” (Excursion)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Catalyst: “Stirb, Lieb’ und Freud’!” (Catastrophe)</td>
<td>Stagnation: “Stille Liebe” (Depression)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Compensation I: “Wanderlied” (Euphoria)</td>
<td>Contraction: “Frage” (Quintessence)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Decompensation: “Erstes Grün” (Irritation)</td>
<td>Extraction: “Stille Thränen” (Perversion)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Insufficiency: “Sehnsucht nach der Waldgegend” (Fiasco)</td>
<td>Finale: “Wer machte dich so krank?” and “Alte Laute” (Transcendence)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Catharsis: “Auf das Trinkglas eines verstorbenen Freundes” (Hermeneutic)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although Kreuels’s view does not seem entirely reasonable for the first song, it certainly does for “Stirb, Lieb’ und Freud’!” and “Wanderlied.” As we have acknowledged before, his jilted love is the impetus for the narrative trajectory, and this is first apparent in the next song where he joyously sets forth on his travels. And it also serves as a source of compensation for what he has lost. The very same notion applies to “Wanderung” which shares the same subject heading by Kreuels. For “For Erstes Grün,” “irritation” might also not be apropos. While it is true that the persona intimates a sense of alienation from mankind, he also finds

---
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comfort in nature. Although Schumann’s setting juxtaposes these two ideas between major and minor modes we might think that in the final analysis, consolation in nature prevails since it is the final poetic conceit. The description of “insufficiency” certainly applies to “Sehnsucht nach der Waldgegend,” since the persona acknowledges his past home and how he longs for it. Yet we should question whether “nostalgia” might be a better way to label this song than “fiasco.” After all, he recognizes his displacement through nostalgia and thus the importance of his past.

For the remaining songs, several of Kreuels’s designations seem appropriate. The first is the hermeneutic suggestion for “Auf das Trinkglas eines verstorbenen Freundes.” We find that the persona’s inquiry into the meaning of the chalice evokes the remembrance of his departed friend. It allows him to contemplate his course as he is transformed to an extraordinary state. “Stille Liebe” also might be viewed as a sense of stagnation for the persona: his attempts at a “song of praise” for his beloved are all for not, and his only consolation is silence. And “Frage” does appear to offer the “quintessence” of the persona’s final conclusion: were it not for the existence of nature nothing could heal his sorrowful heart. However, we might question Kreuels’s characterization of perversion (or obstinacy) for “Stille Thränen,” especially in light of where the song stands in the series. The persona’s final sentiment in the poem—after crying his pain away at night, he intimates one would think that morning would render his heart joyful—is a personal query of whether his suffering has truly eased. It marks one of the first moments in the cycle that the speaker questions whether he is truly consoled by nature, and this leads to his ultimate resignation of death in the final song pair.

The reception history for the Kerner Liederreihe displays various assessments of the songs, focusing now on individual numbers, now on the complete group. As we have seen,
writers, performers, and critics in recent years have increasingly come to regard op. 35 as a “work,” and to investigate its genesis and structure in this light. But while the present study has noted the changing aesthetic values brought to op. 35 by critics from the nineteenth-century up to current times, we should not dismiss the ways in which nineteenth-century and early twentieth-century critics evaluated op. 35 and its songs. Even though the early reception history for op. 35 generally did not address the collection as a whole and only discussed individual songs, much of this had to do with the very manner in which Schumann’s songs were performed during the nineteenth-century. The performance of single numbers and almost never a complete cycle, suggests to David Ferris “that the integrity of the whole was not as inviolable in [Schumann’s] day as we have made it today.” With this in mind, it is not surprising that early critics were interested only individual numbers rather than defining a cycle as a unified structure.

While the various critical responses of op. 35 were, and still are shaped by trends in performance and scholarship, we can see that the cycle declined in importance, and practically disappeared in the years preceding World War II, despite the fact that Lieder had moved from the venue of Hausmusik to that of Konzertmusik in the early twentieth-century. Turchin’s work marks the point at which a growing esteem for op. 35 as a whole began. A new appraisal of the Liederreihe in Rölleke’s and Köhler’s work sought to define its musical style and meaning (Rölleke), and its coherence (Köhler), by taking an account of the compositional history outlined by Schumann in LbIII and TbII. And although Hans-Udo Kreuls analysis essentially recapitulates many of the ideas from Rölleke, Köhler, and

---

Fischer-Dieskau, his work represents the first volume dedicated solely op. 35 and the rest of Schumann’s Kerner settings.

Further evidence of a growing esteem for op. 35 also appears in the number of recordings that have surfaced in modern times. We find that from the turn of last century through 1945, only individual numbers from the Liederreihe were recorded. And by far, “Wanderlied” was the song of choice for performers.89 Furthermore, before Dietrich Fischer-Dieskau recorded op. 35 as a whole in his collection of Schumann Songs from 1975-1979, only individual numbers from the Liederreihe (most specifically, “Erstes Grün,” “Lust der Sturmnacht,” “Frage,” “Sehnsucht nach der Waldgegend,” and “Stille Thränen”) appeared on vinyl.90 While only a handful of songs from op. 35 were recorded, we find several Schumann cycles (most specifically Dichterliebe and Frauenliebe und Leben) in recordings on numerous occasions and by numerous artists during this same time. But several complete recordings of op. 35 exist today: a recent check of its availability on Amazon shows no less than six different CDs from various artists who have recorded the entire cycle in the past ten years.

Even though the Kerner Liederreihe has never received the same attention from scholars as other Schumann cycles, it appears that the “misunderstanding” and “misinterpretation” for this opus, as noted by Turchin, has lessened somewhat in recent years. While it is true that op. 35 follows different conventions (both in its narrative and musical substance) from Schumann’s better known song cycles, recent scholars have specifically addressed the unique aspects of the songs and show, in many ways, how the composer made sense out of his collection of Kerner’s poetry as a Wanderlieder cycle.


90 Calum MacDonald, Gramophone Classical Catalogue (London, 1979), 165. See also Dorthy Stahl, A Selected Discography of Solo Song: A Culmination Through 1971 (Detroit, 1972), 67-70.
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