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The Speculative Content of Schoenberg’s Harmonielehre

John F. Spratt

As might be expected, Arnold Schoenberg’s Harmonielehre, published in 1911, represented a considerable departure from traditional practice. Even the most tradition-influenced section on chorale harmonization contains a statement of purpose which can be paraphrased as follows: “It is not a question of harmonizing, but of the creative use of harmony. One may have to make corrections, yet not in terms of theory, but by virtue of one’s sense of form . . . corrections are to be arrived at intuitively.” Where such an attitude is expressly stated, even with respect to chorale harmonization, it is not surprising that the remainder of the book emphasizes the creation of original harmonic progressions without the guidance of a given melody or bass line.

There are limits to pedagogical originality, however. The author still finds it necessary to enumerate the diatonic chords in C major and to state that in the first exercises the root of the chord must always be in the bass and that in the key of A minor a chord containing an F♯ may never be followed by one containing G♯. Such instructions are, of course, indispensable. Yet in the version of the book most widely used in the English-speaking world there is little other than instructions of this nature. I refer to Robert D. W. Adams’s translation, Theory of Harmony (New York: Philosophical Library, 1948). Dr. Adams states that this edition is intended for the practical use of students, and that much philosophical material has been omitted, but he notes that “the essentials—explanations, directions, examples—have been included” (p. xi). Dr. Adams states further that “some American readers may be surprised, perhaps a bit disappointed, to find here a treatise on traditional harmony, handled from a conservative, even strict point of view, when they may have expected a dissertation on the twelve-tone system or a survey of ‘ultra-modern’ harmony” (p. xi).

The Adams translation is based on the Leitfaden2 by Erwin Stein, a practical guide to the Harmonielehre, from which all speculative portions were excluded. Dr. Stein’s Leitfaden presumably had the approval of Schoenberg himself. However, that such approval was at least qualified may be inferred from Schoenberg’s sardonic comments, in his own preface to the Leitfaden volume (p. 3), to the effect that Stein’s book would enable the reader to ignore the speculative portions of the Harmonielehre and would eventually cause three-quarters of the book to be forgotten.

It thus appears possible that the omitted portions of the book are at least as “essential” as the practical instructions. This consideration prompted Roy E. Carter to undertake the first complete English translation of the

The portions omitted by Stein and Adams, and which this paper refers to as the speculative content, are very substantial. A deep preoccupation with nature’s bearing on culture in general and the art of music in particular is apparent throughout the book. Speaking of cultural systems, Schoenberg says on pp. 5–6:

... A real system should above all consist of principles which account for all phenomena. Ideally, just so many phenomena as actually exist, no more, no less. Such principles are the laws of nature. And only such principles, which admit of no exceptions, can claim the unqualified validity of natural law. However, laws of art are conspicuous mainly for their exceptions.

[Universally valid] artistic principles have so far eluded me (as well as others), and it is doubtful whether any such will soon be formulated. Attempts to base art entirely on nature will continue to be abortive. The attempt to formulate artistic law can at most have the merit of a good comparison (that of influencing perception). This is a considerable merit. ... Yet one must never imagine that such miserable achievements constitute eternal laws comparable to the laws of nature. I repeat: natural law is true without exception, but theories of art consist mainly of exceptions [italics added].

From this and many similar passages, Schoenberg appears as a determinist with respect to nature, a relativist with regard to culture, a Spinozian naturalist in the sense of regarding nature as an exemplary system and regarding inference from nature as a vital force in culture. (He states only that efforts to base culture entirely on nature are bound to be unsuccessful.) Yet anyone so preoccupied with the overtone series as a justification for his harmonic practice regards nature, ipso facto, as a vital force in culture.

Since the term “relativism” has certain unfavorable connotations that are ineradicable, the writer feels constrained to employ the term “contextualism” to describe Schoenberg’s attitude toward culture. This attitude has two major consequences: firstly, a marked hostility toward existing attempts to formulate cultural law and, secondly, an extreme skepticism in his own musical system with regard to any ultimate principle.

The hostility toward existing cultural systems accounts for the savage invective in which the book abounds and which constitutes the main reason for excluding certain portions from classroom use. The formulators of musical law are known variously as music historians, theorists, musicologists, and aestheticians, all of whose professions are the objects of Schoenberg’s unremitting derision. He makes it a point of honor, while discussing the history of music, to explain that he has never read a history of music (p. 80). Hugo Riemann is acknowledged to be a man of profound intellect. However, Schoenberg himself had surmised what Riemann laboriously “proved”
concerning the development of organum: namely, that organum developed into real polyphony only because of the introduction of contrary motion. Thus, without the aid of scholarship (Wissenschaft) he arrives at the same conclusions. He is not a Wissenschaftler, he says, but self-taught and relying solely on the power of thought.

Heinrich Schenker is depicted as a man of rare talent and learning. But, in his contention that the golden age of music is past, he is similar to a man capable of judging only ripe apples, not green ones. His emphasis on the magic number five is demonstrably false, since G is the third tone of the (C-major) triad, the seventh tone of the chromatic scale (calling C♯ the first), etc. Nature, says Schoenberg, is too inscrutable for us to be able to divine her secrets so easily. Again, he has not read Schenker's book but has simply glanced at a few of its pages.

His sharpest invective is reserved for aestheticians. He makes it plain at the outset that his Harmonielehre is not concerned with aesthetics, but rather with a skill comparable to good cabinetmaking. His discussion of "non-harmonic" tones—some of which allegedly, in existing aesthetic systems, are declared to be either beautiful or ugly—includes a reference to notable "non-harmonic" passages in the works of J. S. Bach. With great cunning Bach has concealed such passages in a motet; according to Schoenberg, the theorists cannot read Bach's old clefs and the aestheticians cannot hear the passing tones (p. 392).

Consequently, the least endearing aspect of Schoenberg's creative personality is revealed in this book: a petulant disdain for music scholarship in all its forms. A more constructive corollary of this attitude is the extreme skepticism with regard to eternal law in his own writing. In this he resembles his contemporary William James, who once declared of psychology, a science in which he occupies a founder's position, "What a science! Not one law, not one principle." Schoenberg's contextualism thus leads him to observe that it matters little whether one's initial hypothesis is "correct" or not, for in the long run both the true and the false hypotheses will be proven inadequate (p. 16). The use of consonance and dissonance as antithetical terms is unjustifiable, the difference being one of degree (p. 18). The laws of a work of art (p. 32) are incidental rather than necessary features, and they are possibly laws of perception more than of art. The melodic progression F–E is most convincing if given the aspect of necessity by appropriate harmonization; however, there are no absolutely reliable means of ensuring this aspect of necessity (p. 100). Any and all rules in the Harmonielehre may be set aside by a more urgent necessity, and this is perhaps the only rule that is admissible. (Even here, appealing to the ultimate criterion of necessity, Schoenberg has already recognized it to be a relative term.) Laws concerning rhythm valid in earlier music hardly hold true for Bach and are actually reversed in Beethoven, Schumann, and Brahms. He doubts that a unifying principle may be formulated. Needless to say, he denies any ultimate status to tonality as an alleged natural law of musical composition.
But the degree of arbitrariness he ascribes to the tonal system is indeed surprising. He does not necessarily contend that triads are arbitrary, but he does attribute the system of building chords in thirds above the triad to nothing more profound than the make-up of manuscript paper, whereby the lines and the spaces are respectively a third apart. From this paltry, ridiculous circumstance (says Schoenberg) arises the conviction that C-E-G-Bb is a "chord" whereas C-E-G-D is not. He does not believe in the "golden section" as a principle of musical art; he regards the tempered system merely as a truce in the struggle for musical expression; above all, he denies the aesthetic premise (p. 394) that certain chords or sounds are intrinsically beautiful or ugly. The artist is not concerned with beauty, which tends to be a personal preference, nor even with truth, the knowledge of which would be unbearable. The artist creates out of inner necessity (Bedürfnis) and is concerned only with integrity (Wahrhaftigkeit), of which, indeed, beauty, order, and intelligibility are likely to be by-products (p. 395).

Schoenberg's reverence for natural law is not shared by all philosophers of science. Such men as Bertrand Russell and A. S. Eddington have felt that the laws of nature, as inviolable truisms, really relate nothing to us of nature. The force of this attitude may be very clearly seen with reference to the law most basic to musical art, the law of the vibrating body, whereby frequency varies inversely with length. A piano string two feet long will produce the octave of one four feet long. However, piano strings do not exist in nature. A host of exclusions also exists: density, tension, and other properties must remain constant. The law is true eternally and without exception, but only if one takes very elaborate precautions to make it true. It is therefore as much a law of culture as of nature. Not to deny the reality of nature, the writer still believes in ontological deposits of iron ore existing independently of culture and from which piano strings (and also Pythagorean anvils) are made.

The purpose of the above example is twofold: first, to show that Schoenberg's sharp distinction between cultural and natural law is to some extent unnecessary, and, second, to suggest that culture is no less amenable to the formulation of law than is nature, provided that one acknowledges truistic reasoning as a legitimate instrument. Thus, Schoenberg's anticipation of Riemann's conclusion, that polyphony did not develop until after the introduction of contrary motion, is a truistic statement. What he calls polyphony (Mehrstimmigkeit) is largely synonymous with counterpoint; the notions of contrast, contrariety, and other derivatives of the word contra are indispensable features of counterpoint, as we know it. One may go further and state that the rhythmic and melodic complementarity found in a Bach fugue or a Beethoven sonata is the distinguishing feature of Western music, the musical logos of the Western world, since it is a feature sufficiently abstract to survive even the abandonment of the tempered system, i.e., in electronic music. What Riemann and Schoenberg note is the first indication of such a conclusion.
Likewise, Schoenberg’s observation (p. 289) that sounds appearing as suspensions or passing tones in Bach and Beethoven later appear as self-sufficient chords in Wagner is a specific instance of the more abstract view that culture evolves from the implicit to the explicit. In this manner 19th-century harmony may be regarded not as something essentially new but as an explicit form of something already implicit in the 18th century, just as 19th-century technology develops the implications of Newtonian science. The musical revolution of the 15th century consists to a great extent in developing the triadic harmonic system, which is more clearly implicit in Machaut than in the 13th century. Finally, this eminently truistic proposition, which depicts culture as evolving like a Socratic dialogue, also describes Schoenberg’s own development as a composer. It is demonstrable that his Opus 11 for piano employs atonal practices implicit in the second quartet and that, as Schoenberg himself often said, his first serial works are to a great extent conscious formulations of organizational devices previously present in a manner of which he himself only gradually became aware.

Despite his low regard for cultural law, Schoenberg does view history as an orderly, even a natural process. He feels that the medieval church modes, which he numbers at seven, were reduced to two, major and minor, in more modern times, and that these two were reduced to one, the chromatic mode, in very recent times. He represents this process as one of simplification, with the suggestion that all notable advances are simplifications. This is undoubtedly true in a sense; yet the simplification is relative to the situation, and not progressive. Thus, while the system of Copernicus must have seemed simpler than that of medieval astronomers, one can hardly say that Albert Einstein’s system is simpler than that of Copernicus. Nevertheless, cycles of complexity and simplicity, contextually and tautologically defined, can convey insight into the course of history. It is likely that the expansion of the modal system to twelve by Glareanus in the 16th century constituted an unviable complexity, and that the de facto reduction of twelve modes to two (which is observable in Willaert, for example) was ultimately made explicit as the major-minor harmonic system. This system is neither more nor less simple than the original modal system, but it is simpler and more workable than a modal system acutely out of accord with musical practice. One is reminded of Einstein’s dictum that the truth is the simplest explanation. In due course the major-minor system also became discrepant with actual practice. Schoenberg relates (p. 309) that he had witnessed vigorous dispute over the root of the first chord in Tristan. Such disagreement is symptomatic of discussions involving systems in decline. Like many of his contemporaries, Schoenberg observes of the late 19th century that harmonies had become so ambiguous that any note and any chord could be related. Therefore, the final reduction of two modes to one is, if not necessarily simpler than previous systems in their prime, certainly simpler than the existing attempts to account for new phenomena with an old system, and simpler in the sense of recognizing and organizing a de facto situation.
Both culture and nature may thus be regarded as processes of constant and irreversible change, wherein no law is eternal except as it removes itself from the world of transient phenomena. Readers of Plato's dialogues will not find this a markedly original view. As Whitehead noted, any thorough analysis of Western civilization is likely to become a commentary on Plato. An analysis of Western music tends to travel in the same direction. May we not say that Schoenberg's preoccupation with musical law is another commentary upon Plato?

NOTES

1 A. Schoenberg, Harmonielehre (Vienna, 1922), p. 342. All translations and paraphrases in this article are by the author.
2 The complete title is Praktischer Leifaden zu Schönberg's Harmonielehre: Ein Hilfsbuch für Lehrer und Schüler (Vienna, 1923).
Grocheo and The Measurability of Medieval Music: 
A Reply to Hendrik Vanderwerf

J. E. Maddrell

The pleasure I had in discovering that Dr. Vanderwerf had found my article on Mensura (Current Musicology 10:64–68) worth replying to was somewhat diminished by the realization that he had not recognized its purpose. My article clearly reveals that I do not rely on treatises for my information on medieval music. The suggestion I made was that a scholar transcribing monody might need non-paleographic guidance in evaluating the often inconclusive evidence of musical notation. There can be no question of relying on “treatises” (in the plural) since Grocheo’s is the only work to discuss secular monody. Excerpts from other treatises were quoted because they had a bearing on my semantic discussion of the term mensura, except for my brief citation of Anonymous IV’s remarks on the interpretation of non-mensural notation. My conclusion was that, while there is no theoretical evidence for “free rhythm,” our methods of transcribing monody should take full account of the Chansonnier Cangé and the later additions to the MS du Roi—neither of which, I might add, supports a strictly modal method of transcription. The main significance of the article, however, was the proof that mensura, for Grocheo and other theorists, did not primarily mean quantitative measurement.

A full discussion of the Chansonnier Cangé would, therefore, have been hardly appropriate, even if it could have been contained within the limits of a single article. The fact that the Cangé scribe did use longs and breves for single notes, however erratically, is not to be explained away by saying that he was influenced by motet notation; nor does it argue for “free rhythm,” although it may imply the use of non-modal fixed rhythms.

As for the practical value of Grocheo’s treatise, it is hardly good scholarship to dismiss a source merely because it does not support one’s own view. The only evidence Dr. Vanderwerf adduces in support of his extraordinary opinion that Grocheo is of questionable value as an authority is a paragraph of generalization, vague in expression as in thought (“many treatises,” “in many instances,” “such treatises,” “learned authors,” but not a single concrete instance), about a distinction between Musica and music. If by “treatises about Musica” Dr. Vanderwerf means philosophical treatises in the Boethian tradition of musica speculativa, treatises that were not concerned with practical music, then one can only marvel at the eccentricity of a view which would associate Grocheo, of all theorists, with the speculative tradition—Grocheo, whose avowed intention was to avoid speculative theory and concentrate on the music of Paris as performed in his own day!

Dr. Vanderwerf questions my interpretation of passages from Grocheo dealing with the instrumental ductia and the cantus coronatus. I cited the former
because it is by nature a form in fixed rhythm, yet Grocheo included it with monodic song as "music not precisely measured"; the conclusion is either that Grocheo was a half-wit or that mensuratum has a meaning distinct from the modern sense of quantitative measurement. The passage about the cantus coronatus is hardly so obscure as Dr. Vanderwerf claims. The "crowning" can refer only to accompaniment or to ornamentation of the melody; I now think ornamentation by the singer to be more likely. In any case, it cannot mean "crowned in a contest," since it would be the singer, not the song, that was crowned.

I am surprised that Dr. Vanderwerf should believe that Anonymous IV was referring to polyphony in free rhythm in the passage quoted at the end of my article. Anonymous IV in this section of his treatise is preoccupied with methods of reading ligatures and single notes, and it is obvious from the context, to say nothing of his use of such mensural terms as "cum proprietate" and "cum perfectione," that he has regular rhythms in mind. Besides, any system which deduced rhythm from the ligatures must have had fixed rhythms. I am equally surprised that Dr. Vanderwerf should feel that if all the trouvère songs were sung in fixed rhythm, some theorist "would have amply described it." I regard this as an argumentum ex silentio, one of the classic errors in logic.

Perhaps Dr. Vanderwerf will publish the evidence on which he bases his view that in an ideal performance of a song the text would have "the undivided attention of performer and listener alike," whereas the melody would be only "simple and unobtrusive." Ideal from what point of view? And is one justified in assuming that medieval taste in the relation of text to music was that of any other period—the 16th century, for example, or the 19th?

Happily, I can welcome at least the spirit of Dr. Vanderwerf's closing remarks on the importance of ethnological evidence, which has thus far not received sufficient attention. The real question, after all, is not which kind of evidence—paleographic, theoretical, ethnological—should carry the most weight, but how one can best use all three kinds together.
The Growth of a Musical Idea—Beethoven’s Opus 96

Mary Rowen Obelkevich

One of the most fascinating aspects of Beethoven scholarship is an examination of his extant manuscript sources for a composition from the first rough ideas to the polished work of art. In this study I shall concentrate upon the various factors which played a role in his creation of the G major sonata for violin and piano, Opus 96, including the borrowing, manipulation, and revision of musical ideas within the structural fabric of the composition.

There are four main manuscript sources which contain Beethoven’s progressive work on Opus 96—Beethoven Autograph Ms. 41 of the Gesellschaft der Musikfreunde, Vienna; the Petter sketchbook; Ms. 60 of the Conservatoire National, Paris, Collection Malherbe; and the autograph score of the sonata owned by the Pierpont Morgan Library of New York City.1

The earliest of these documents, Ms. 41, contains a draft of the melody which Beethoven utilized as the theme of the Finale of Opus 96, as well as sketches for the Chorfantasie, Opus 80, and the beginning of the Goethe song, "Kennst du das Land" (in its second version). I call the presentation of the Opus 96 melody a draft rather than a sketch, because it is not a broad scheme for the structure of an extended musical area, nor does it represent detailed work on a problematic compositional section; rather, it has the appearance of a small, well-determined musical entity. The incomplete
elements in the notation of the melody's setting seem to be abbreviations employed by Beethoven to facilitate the copying-out process rather than omissions of content due to creative indecision on his part. Key signature, meter, and clefs are self-evident.

The manuscript is undated and is not known to have been part of a specific conglomerate of sketches. However, Beethoven completed the third sketched item, “Kennst du das Land,” during the summer of 1810, before his first meeting with Bettina von Arnim. Therefore, it is likely that the sheet was compiled during the prior months, perhaps from the end of 1809.\(^2\) (Ex. I).

The accompanied tune bears a striking resemblance to Jobsen’s song, “Der Knieriem bleibt, meiner Treu!” from Der lustige Schuster, the second part of the comic opera Der Teufel ist los, with text by C. F. Weisse and music by J. C. Standfuss. Both parts of this Singspiel survive only in a revised and augmented version by Johann Adam Hiller. Standfuss may well have taken the folk-like tune from the second strain of a song, “Ich bin nun wie ich bin,” found in Sperontes’ collection Der singende Muse an der Pleisse. Only speculations may be made as to the precise origins of the melody.\(^3\) (Ex. II).

There are, of course, many means by which Beethoven may have become acquainted with this well-circulated tune. Neefe, who was one of Beethoven’s earliest teachers, was a student, admirer, and close friend of Hiller.\(^4\) Undoubtedly, Beethoven heard his instructor praise Hiller, and probably studied some of Hiller’s vocal compositions. Also, some of Hiller’s immensely popular Singspiele were among the operas presented at the court of Bonn during Beethoven’s youth.\(^5\) In fact, Hiller’s operas were on the boards well into the 19th century. It is plausible that Beethoven attended a production of Der Teufel ist los given in December 1809 in Vienna. Although surviving
records indicate that only the first part of this work was presented, it is very likely that, according to custom, the second half followed a day to a few weeks later. At this time, Beethoven may well have become attracted to the rollicking tune with its earthy quality, humor, and potential for artistic manipulation.\(^6\)

The next important source of Opus 96 consists of some sketches found in the Petter sketchbook. This manuscript is composed of two sections which, although unrelated in physical characteristics and content, were bound together. The first of these is short, containing 12 folios, and probably dates from the winter of 1808–09. The second, however, is much more extensive; it consists of 65 folios representing work from the middle of 1811 into the following year.\(^7\)

Sketches of Opus 96 come from this latter portion of the compilation, occupying much of the last pages of the manuscript (72r, 73v-r, 74v). Immediately preceding the sketches of Opus 96 are some for the 8th Symphony, which was completed in October 1812. Following the sonata (74r) is a sketch of the song "An die Geliebte," first setting, Wo O 140.

These folia contain ink sketches which serve as melodic guides to the last three movements of Opus 96. As far as I know, this is the first place where Beethoven wrote out a broad outline for the sonata. The main themes, continuity between movements, and some melodic detail are fairly well established. In addition to these sketches, there are some crayon sketches—which seem to be different in purpose—for the Adagio on 72r and the Allegro Moderato on 73v. The crayon Adagio sketches are modifications of the ink ones. The Allegro sketches also appear to be revisions of an earlier model, but no set of ink sketches for this movement is present in the Petter sketchbook. It seems likely that the crayon sketches were written a good deal later than the ink ones, perhaps after Beethoven had started to write out his autograph score of Opus 96, and that, having referred to the Petter sketchbook for this purpose, he found it necessary to experiment with some of the musical ideas before composing his finished version.\(^8\) (Ex. III).

A comparison of the above version of the Poco Allegretto theme with that in Ms. 41 presents some features of great interest. The themes are quite similar in overall contour, despite the striking divergences. The beginning of the second section of the melody (m. 9) reveals a combination of a misleadingly innocent melodic alteration with what might be called a harmonic insertion between the simple tonic and subdominant harmonies of Ms. 41 (mm. 8 and 9 respectively). In the Petter version, Beethoven alters the melody by retaining the shape of his opening motive, that is, leaping up a fourth from F# to B rather than ascending a half-step to G. The scalewise descent of a tetrachord is retained in both versions. This tetrachord has, of course, the same intervallic construction as either tetrachord of a major scale. Thus, the first F# in Ms. 41 functions as the third of a lower tetrachord starting on D, and so implies the scale/harmonic color of D major. Beethoven enters the subdominant key area, and maintains it until the dominant of the
penultimate measure. In the Petter version, the F♯ functions as the first tone of an upper tetrachord carrying the harmonic implication of the dominant of B major, the majored mediant area of G major.

A closely related change that Beethoven makes from the Petter theme to his final version in the Morgan autograph is that of altering the first F♯ of m. 9 to an A♯. In contrast to the preceding harmonic simplicity, this A♯ leading-tone, remote from the system of G major, reinforces the turning point in harmonic emphasis. The A♯–B leading-tone-tonic implication is paralleled in m. 13, where Beethoven gains the subdominant by using B as the leading tone of C. Consequently, he attains this main structural area of the earlier
B. CRAYON SKETCHES FOR THE ALLEGRO MODERATO
version after a “delay” of four measures, a harmonic extension which adds a sophisticated polish to the charming folk-like quality of the tune.

Another of the differences between the settings of Ms. 41 and the Petter sketchbook is that in the earlier version Beethoven terminates the melody on the tonic final, whereas in the Petter sketch, on the third degree. The tonic final brings the melodic motion to a halt, giving the tune its aspect of completion, a short but fulfilled musical entity. In the second version, however, the function of the tune has changed—it is now the theme of a continuous chain of variations. Thus, Beethoven’s simple change has had a far-reaching effect on the artistic utility of his musical subject.

The third extant source of Opus 96 is Ms. 60 of the Conservatoire National, Collection Malherbe. Max Unger catalogued and briefly annotated these holdings. Ms. 60 contains Beethoven’s work on two compositions, Opus 96 (the last movement only) and the C major Mass, Opus 86. The work on the sonata was independent of that on the Mass, which was composed during 1807 and performed on September 12 of that year. Unger characterizes the section on Opus 96 as a “Bruchstück aus dem Finale der Sonate in G dur für Violin u. Klavier, W. 96, unbekannte Fassung, in Partiturnässigen Niederschrift.” I wish here to identify these fragments in greater detail.
In the following example, parts A and B are reproductions of the two pages in Ms. 60 containing work on Opus 96, highly dissimilar both in appearance and in function. (Ex. IV).

A is on a sheet of paper ruled with twenty staves. There are five triple staves of score, with every fourth staff left blank. This format is also used

EXAMPLE IV
Part A
Part B

throughout most of the Morgan autograph. The paper, scoring, and style of handwriting of these two sources are strikingly similar, with meticulous indications of dynamics, rests, and accidentals. As was often Beethoven’s practice in fair copy, clefs and key signatures are indicated only in the first measure (of the movement or folio). The writing is, for Beethoven, extremely neat and legible; even the few minor revisions are notated with care—in short, we have Beethoven’s fair copy.

B, in Querformat, contains three systems of score, each separated by a blank staff. Both handwriting and musical content are far less finished than in A. B is a composing score, a working draft, no longer a sketch but not yet a finished copy. It is a musical continuation of A, but not part of the fair copy. There may have been a more polished version of B which was, indeed, in fair copy and corresponded to the second page of the Finale in the Morgan autograph.

From various documents surrounding the first two performances of Opus 96, we know that Beethoven composed two versions of the last movement. These concerts took place on December 29, 1812, and January 7, 1813, with the Archduke Rudolph pianist, Pierre Rode violinist.

Rode, from all accounts, disappointed everyone’s expectations. Apparently, he was well past his prime by 1812, and even critics who had been his
admirers in earlier years failed to find the same fine qualities in his playing. For instance, Louis Spohr, no light appraiser of other violinists' abilities, wrote of the young Rode that the more he heard him perform, the more overcome he was by his playing. In a letter, however, written several months before the first concert, Spohr warned the Archduke that he missed Rode's former boldness in conquering great difficulties. Spohr's review of Rode's recital in the Viennese Redoutensaal, which took place one day before the second performance of Opus 96, was far less diplomatic. He found the playing cold and mannered, the violinist's technical security shattered, his passage work sloppy and unsure.\textsuperscript{10}

Beethoven must have been all the more disappointed since he had gone out of his way to accommodate the whims and abilities of his violinist. It is very likely that the Archduke was excited and flattered at the prospect of performing with a famous foreign artist and that Beethoven, whose income depended almost exclusively upon Rudolph's generosity, had no wish to jeopardize the success of the performance. In a letter written to the Archduke shortly before the first performance,\textsuperscript{11} Beethoven mentions the care taken in revising portions of the last movement and assures him that all will go well: "... In view of Rode's playing I have had to give more thought to the composition of (the last) movement. In our Finales we like to have fairly noisy passages, but Rode does not care for them—and so I have been rather hampered..."

Nevertheless, the performance did not go very well. According to a review in Glöggl's \textit{Musikzeitung}, "The piano part was played with more soul than the violin part; Mr. Rode's greatness does not lie in this type of music but in the performance of the concerto."\textsuperscript{12}

The letter to the Archduke hints at two elements guiding Beethoven's newer version: Rode's playing, with, one assumes, its growing unreliability, and his preference for the legendary "French tradition" of violin writing. This style features mannered rather than bravura passages, polished harmonic and melodic embellishments, delicate phrases, an overall gloss of highly controlled brilliance—elements characteristic of the compositions (especially the concerto) of Rode himself. The rondo-like variation form is fully in keeping with the concerti of Viotti, Kreutzer, Baillot, Rode, Spohr, and others of that school, although it was certainly not bound to the French influence. However, the \textit{Allegretto} of Beethoven's sonata was conceived prior to and independently of any specific consideration of Rode's musical personality.

The kinds of changes which Beethoven made from Ms. 60 to the version in the Morgan autograph confirm these observations. The basic structure of the composition has been fully retained, despite the alterations. These latter fall into three categories: technical simplification of the violin part; refinement of the piano part, giving more finesse to the left hand by softening the reiterated rhythmic pulses of the octaves (especially in mm. 4, 5, 8, 16) and filling in the harmonic colors formerly supplied by the violin;
and changing of several details of melodic figuration (especially from m. 19 on). In m. 17 the first note is still the F# of Ms. 41 rather than the A# of the Morgan autograph. A of Ms. 60, nonetheless, is very similar to the final version.

The most important late manuscript source of Opus 96 is Beethoven's autograph score of the sonata. This document, signed and dated by the composer, is exceedingly well preserved. The score comprises twelve large sheets of paper, each folded over to provide four pages. These four-page gatherings were, in turn, sewn together into the present order. Two sets of small, rough-edged holes, punched through the bulk of the manuscript, give evidence of an earlier, more rudimentary binding, quite possibly improvised by Beethoven himself. A piece of thread may have been pulled through these punctures in order to hold the individual gatherings together, but to allow sheets to be removed and inserted without difficulty. Someone other than Beethoven has numbered the upper outside corner of each page of music in pencil. Aside from these penciled numbers, the first six pages of the last movement (29–34) were numbered 1 to 6 by Beethoven in ink, presumably when he replaced the earlier version with this one.

Some pages of the score have been left blank, as indicated in the following chart:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Allegro Moderato, pp. 1–8</th>
<th>p. 9 blank, beginning of gathering which extends through p. 12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pp. 14–16 blank, completion of gathering which starts on p. 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scherzo, pp. 17–21</td>
<td>pp. 22–24 blank, completion of gathering which starts on p. 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adagio, pp. 25–28</td>
<td>one gathering, no blank pp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poco Allegretto, pp. 29–44</td>
<td>pp. 45–46, which complete the final gathering, are blank.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most of these blank pages seem to indicate revisions of the sonata which were too extensive to be made directly in the text. Beethoven copied these passages onto fresh gatherings in order to assure a neat manuscript which could be bound by joining the four-page units. Thus, he avoided tearing out a rejected page when he could have done so without detaching good material as well. He probably found it necessary to copy music retained from the replaced gathering onto the new one, and then to continue with the revised music. For this reason, we usually cannot determine where alterations begin, although we assume that they probably end very near to the blank portion of each gathering.

Page 9 was left blank under different circumstances. There are numerous corrections throughout p. 8, indicating that Beethoven had more difficulty in writing out the music (of mm. 172–90) than he had anticipated. He seems to have proceeded to the following measures, and to have left a blank page for possible further changes.

The above chart also indicates that in the Morgan autograph, the Scherzo
is bound in front of the Adagio. This order is the reverse of the position of these movements in the Petter sketches, the Steiner first authentic edition of the sonata, and the early Birchall edition. Furthermore, the former ordering defies musical logic. In the Morgan score, the key signature of the Scherzo is notated , indicating that this movement follows one written in three flats. The first movement, in G major, hardly satisfies this requirement. The Adagio, however, is in the flat submediant area of G, namely E flat.

The most convincing musical proof of the sequence of movements is offered by a revision at the end of the Adagio, the bridge section leading to the Scherzo. (Ex. V.)

![Example V](image-url)
The chief difference between this passage and its final revision lies in the metric structure. The discarded section may be divided into the following broad phrase units, determined primarily by rate of harmonic motion. (Ex. VI.)

Two features of the above scheme work against a fluid and tightly unified transition into the Scherzo: m. 62 falls on the weakest part of the phrase, and the spondaic organization of mm. 62–64 is abandoned in m. 65, reverting to the less assertive trochees featured throughout the earlier portion of the movement.

As early as the Petter sketches, Beethoven seems to have been striving for an unbroken union of the Adagio with what is now the Scherzo. No distinction is made between the movements; they are not independently labeled, or separated by double bars. Moreover, the harmonies glide into one another in a remarkably smooth progression. However, Beethoven does not commit himself to a written statement of the transition itself. Perhaps his first attempt to compose the passage is represented by this deleted section of the autograph score.
Measure 62 of this earlier version anticipates the Scherzo through its metric organization. The Adagio, up to m. 62, contains two main pulses to the bar, a stressed and an unstressed. The Scherzo, on the other hand, has only one pulse per measure. Thus, the spondaic pattern introduced in m. 62 links these schemes; the tempo of the Scherzo is set by the half-measure pulses of m. 62 which, in turn, derive from the duple meter of the Adagio.

These same features are prominent in Beethoven's revision of the passage. Measure 62 no longer shares the harmonies of m. 61, but is set in the tonic. Thus, the structural harmonic weight of the tonic coupled with the new rhythmic organization combine to draw our attention to m. 62. This latter measure is now established as the beginning rather than the end of a phrase grouping. (Ex. VII.)

EXAMPLE VII

In the final version Beethoven alters the metric scheme to unify it with that of the Scherzo. The hemiola figure, now shifted to the cadence, is extremely effective, for whereas it does not break the metric continuity between movements, it differentiates them and gives the impression of slowing down without actually slackening the tempo. This device permits the rhythmic scheme to end in a state of uncertainty, which, coupled with the harmonic ambiguity of the tritone, is resolved by the Scherzo. One might say that measures 62 ff. are as much a part of one movement as the other. It is this unusual kind of bridge—and there is an analogous instance leading to the final Poco Allegretto—that gives the sonata its remarkable inner unity, its seamless flow of music, a quality shared by many of Beethoven's later works.

Although the Morgan autograph is a fair copy, some extensive insertions, corrections, and revisions demonstrate that Beethoven was still in the process of composing the sonata. I shall discuss some of the most important of these in the order in which they occur in the final version of the composition.

The first major revision is found in the Allegro Moderato, p. 5 of the autograph score. (Ex. VIII.)

Beethoven may have discarded this draft of mm. 101–08 because it anticipates a return to the opening motive of the composition and a harmonic progression to the dominant, both of these features tending to diminish the scope of the development section and the impact of the recapitulation. Therefore, in the final version of this passage, he introduced an additional melodic element (m. 102) taken from m. 84 of the exposition. He also altered
the harmonic color of the later version; the earlier passage seems to attain the dominant in m. 108, whereas in the second the mediant is prolonged throughout mm. 104–07 and the dominant delayed until m. 124, the start of a passage derived from mm. 79–83 of the exposition. Measures 124–39 extend the dominant into the recapitulation (the last beat of m. 139).

Although no passage corresponding exactly to the preliminary version of mm. 101–08 is found elsewhere in the movement, Beethoven seems to have retained much of its motivic shape and modulatory function in a revision of the end of the recapitulation (mm. 247–59). This change is of special interest, since it reveals successive stages in Beethoven’s compositional process.

I think that Beethoven arrived at the final version of mm. 246–60 in the following manner. The first version of this passage led directly from a continuation of the arpeggios of mm. 242–46 into the cadenza-like runs in mm. 260–67. From m. 260 to the end of the movement, both versions coincide. The cadenza ends with a return to the arpeggios (in the tonic as opposed to the earlier diminished-seventh chords) in mm. 268–75. These lead to a last
glimpse of the opening motive (mm. 275–79), which culminates in the upward sweeping scale ending the movement. The newer version postpones the end of the movement, by presenting the opening motive on chromatically ascending degrees of the scale; this passage crescendos towards the excitement of the cadenza. (Ex. IX.)

The earliest sketches for the final shape of mm. 247–59 seem to be in the beginning of the mysterious crayon sketches for the *Allegro Moderato* on f. 73v of the Petter sketchbook (see Ex. III). I believe that after Beethoven crossed out the rejected measures in the autograph score, he jotted down his new ideas on some systems which he had left blank on folios in the Petter sketchbook containing work towards the sonata.

These sketches are also very similar, in part, to the first version of mm. 101–08 (see Ex. VIII). Beethoven’s final version of mm. 248–59 (Ex. X, p. 109) begins with a similar melodic motive, and a diminished chord which might have resolved inwardly to a B♭–D–F♯ chord. However, this progression is denied, and the harmony glides through the C♯ passing tone into an extended V⁷₄ (to m. 261) V₃ (through the end of m. 271) I (from m. 271 to the end of the movement) progression. Thus, the harmonic motion of the final version is prolonged far past the scope of Beethoven’s earlier projections.

Although it may be that Beethoven made additional preliminary sketches for this passage, I do not think that this was necessarily so. Further stages
of composition probably took place "in his head"—the transition of some isolated motives into a flowing, polished sequence of music.

The *Scherzo* appears to have presented few problems to Beethoven. The sketches in the Petter book are so complete that he was probably able to proceed directly from them to the score. On the other hand the *Trio* does not seem to have been as well established in his mind. The Petter sketch is

---

The final version replacing these deleted bars is on p. 13 of the autograph.
I: 1-6, II: 1-7 (see Example 8)
mm. 2-6, final version

---

...
by no means full, nor does it extend over the entire movement. In addition, the sketch for the coda is very different from its present form.

The Trio commences with 14 deleted bars. (Ex. XI, p. 110.) Beethoven’s decision to shift the disposition of the melody (from the piano to the violin and vice versa) forced him to rewrite these measures. He appears to have observed the following procedure for scoring this passage: (1) he wrote in bar lines; (2) copied out the melody—the continuous feature of the music; (3) either added harmonic substance (realizing the implications of the linear motion) and/or worked out melodic refinements. He may have worked from a previously sketched, drafted or composed source, or composed the score directly. Elements of the structural continuity take precedence over details of incidental importance. Always allowing for exceptions, one might even recognize a similar procedure for the composition of the entire sonata.

The Coda brings us again to the Petter sketchbook where the section marked “coda,” separated from the brief sketch of the Trio by a double bar, is very different from the finished version. (Ex. XII, p. 111.) The latter is closely derived from the Scherzo; however, it is in the major mode rather than the minor, and ends with a trill reminiscent of the first movement. Measures 48–51 of the earlier concept of the Coda are retained in the present form. Perhaps mm. 48–82 were once a bridge passage leading directly into the Poco Allegretto, and the opening 16 bars of the Trio were to be continued in a
The remainder of p. 63 is blank.

FACSIMILE
different manner (mm. 33–48). Unfortunately, this problem cannot be solved from the sources at present.

The *Poco Allegretto* contains only two remnants of major revision, neither of which is self-contained in the autograph. The first, already discussed at some length, is the rewriting of the opening portion of the movement, pp. 29–34 of the autograph. The second, which appears to have given Beethoven a good deal of trouble, occurs on p. 41, mm. 227–28. (Ex. XIII, p. 111.)

It seems as though the movement, from m. 227 to the return of the opening theme at m. 245, originally continued in a different manner. The Morgan autograph shows a certain hesitation on Beethoven’s part—many smudges, messy alignments, occasional changes of a note or an ornamental figure. Beethoven, not satisfied with his earlier version, abandoned the score to work out an alternative, then finished the details of his composition directly on the fair copy. (Ex. XIV, p. 112.)

This article has attempted to follow Beethoven’s composition of Opus 96 from its beginning as an isolated musical borrowing to the completed form of the sonata. Although it is not possible to resurrect a man’s creative processes, at least their marks can sometimes be deciphered. In the case of
EXAMPLE XII

probably S\textsuperscript{2} which Beethoven did not bother to write

EXAMPLE XIII

slowly.

The violin part does not seem to have been corrected; either it remained unaltered
entirely throughout the revisions or, as is more likely,

had not been copied when Beethoven altered
the piano part.

[WORK LINE] Hole in paper caused by absence of notehash.

Notes on work line reveal former reading.
Beethoven, these manifest themselves as the traces of a burning force bound by artistic logic.

A man's last works in a genre, or in a phase of his creative activity, are likely to be imbued with a special significance by posterity, as are most manifestations of finality in a transient world. Opus 96 is such a creation. Unlike the earlier sonatas for violin and piano of Opus 12, 23, 24, and 30, Opus 96 is not a composition essentially pianistic in nature with the added color of a violin, a composition which could easily be reworked for keyboard alone (e.g., Opus 23 in A minor). Nor is Opus 96 an exploitation of one instrument, the pianoforte, echoed and somewhat contrasted by the violin, as in the sonatas of Opus 30—especially in the variation movement of the A major sonata, the entirety of the C minor sonata, and (to a far lesser extent) the first movement of the G major sonata.

On the other hand, the Kreutzer Sonata, with its concertante element, is also of different ilk. This work presents two virtuoso parts of equal importance in a contrasted, "competitive" manner. Opus 96 also has moments of brilliance. The final scale of the first movement and the runs in the Trio, thrown back and forth between violin and piano, make great demands upon the players. Yet, the listener welds these feats of technical prowess into the
whole, hears them not as bursts of power but flights of soaring lyricism. Even the double cadenza at the end of the Allegro Moderato, commencing with sparkling figuration shared by both instruments (m. 262) and ending with them combined in an extended trill, achieves a complete blend of instrumental color and musical substance, a great artistic union.

NOTES

1 The writing of this paper was largely inspired by discussions with Alan Tyson during his professorship at Columbia University in the spring of 1969. I should like to acknowledge, with deep appreciation, permission granted by Mrs. Evelyn Hertzmann and Professor Edward Lippman of Columbia University to use materials assembled by the late Eric Hertzmann. I am also indebted to the trustees of the Pierpont Morgan Library and its librarian, Herbert Cahoon, for allowing me to study the Library’s signed autograph score of Beethoven’s Sonata in G for Violin and Piano, Opus 96, and to use some photographic reproductions of this score for illustrations. I am also grateful to the librarian of the Columbia University Music Library, Thomas Watkins, and his staff.

2 Franz Grasberger, Gesellschaft der Musikkfreunde in Wien. Die Handschriften der Meister. Berühmte Werke der Tonkunst im Autograph, Vienna, 1966, p. 114, identifies the motive on line 1 of Ms. 41 as “der Entwurf eines Themas für Streich-quartette.” I was not able to verify this statement. The copy of Ms. 41 at my disposal is a diplomatic transcription among Dr. Hertzmann’s notes. Kinsky-Halm gives the time of composition for “Kennst du das Land” (second version) as 1809. This is confirmed by Thayer-Forbes 1:493ff. The song was published as “Mignon” by Breitkopf und Härtel in October 1810, as the first of six songs with pianoforte accompaniment, Opus 75, dedicated to Princess Caroline von Kinsky.


5 Thayer-Forbes 1:67.


7 Max Unger, Neues Beethoven Jahrbuch (1933) 5:445f, presents a brief catalogue of the “grosse Pettersche Skizzenbuch,” named after the Viennese collector Gustav A. Petter, who possessed it around the mid-19th century. This catalogue is superseded by Unger’s useful and thorough Eine Schweizer Beethoven Sammlung, Zurich, 1939, p. 164. The sketchbook now forms part of the Bodmer collection owned by the Beethovenhaus in Bonn.

8 For a transcription of the main body of the ink sketches of Opus 96 in the Petter sketchbook, as well as a brief discussion of the sonata, see Gustav Nottebohm, Beethoveniana I, Leipzig, 1872, pp. 26–30. To my knowledge, the crayon sketches have not been transcribed or analyzed.
14 The uppermost of these holes is approximately 4.1 cm. from the top of the page, the lower 5.5 cm. from the bottom.
Aubrey S. Garlington—*The Concept of the Marvelous in French and German Opera, 1770–1840*

Ann Arbor: University Microfilms (UM order no. 66–4182, 1965. 571 pp., University of Illinois diss.)

*James D. Freeman*

This is a careful and accurate study of the principal volcanic eruptions, magical rites, *dei ex machina*, snowstorms, ghosts, floods, battles, and other manifestations of "le merveilleux" in opera from Gluck and Mozart to Meyerbeer and Marschner. Garlington shows the marvelous (which in his discussion includes any sort of spectacular stage effect, natural or supernatural) to have been a consistently dominant trait in the history of French opera in addition to having provided the motivating force in the development of German Romantic opera. In accord with August von Schlegel and E. T. A. Hoffmann, he feels that fantasy, as much as music itself, lies at the heart of the nature of opera of all countries.

Garlington's thesis is that the marvelous as a dramatic idea changes very little in these seventy years but that composers' concepts of its musical significance are continually changing. His method is to trace the occurrences of the marvelous in the most successful operas of the era and to examine the developing relationship between music and the fantastic events on the stage. He produces a survey that treats some areas more conclusively than others. Late 18th-century France, for instance, receives very thorough coverage, while the same period in Germany, though teeming with Singspiel subjects on magic and fantasy, is largely brushed aside in deference to the importance of *Zauberflöte*. 

His nearly complete abstinence from any discussion of Italian opera and its relationship to the North (*Idomeneo* and *Don Giovanni* are treated as examples of Mozartean rather than Italian opera) is partly to be expected in a dissertation dealing specifically with France and Germany. Yet Italian opera was still flourishing in Paris, Vienna, Dresden, and Munich and was, thus, an influential part of the operatic scene in both French- and German-speaking countries. Moreover, the Rossini craze that held northern Europe in a decade-long trance from 1820 on had a much greater effect on non-Italian music of all types than Berlioz, for one, would have liked; and even he was not entirely untouched by it.

Garlington does deal briefly with Rossini's French operas and revisions, of course; but such important Italian contributions to the concept of the marvelous as Carafa's *Gabriella di Vergy* (1816), Pacini's *L'ultimo giorno di
**Pompeï** (1825), Salvatore Viganò's spectacular Milan ballets, as well as Rossini's own *Mosè in Egitto* (the earlier version of the French *Moïse*) and *Semiramide*, go unmentioned. Concerning late 18th-century Italy, both opera seria and opera buffa had tended to avoid fantasy as an integral part of a dramatic work, the one because its best librettists most often treated fantastic events as off-stage occurrences to be pondered later in recitative and aria, the other because its subject matter was more often concerned with the intrigue of everyday life than with cataclysmic events. But Italian stage design had remained justifiably famous for its aesthetic as well as spectacular qualities. Italian audiences were certainly not unaccustomed to spectacular scenery when J. S. Mayr and some of his contemporaries around 1800 began to make use of French subjects that incorporated the marvelous directly and emphatically into the drama. Mayr's *Elisa* (1801) and his second setting of *Lodoiska* (1800), for example, were based on earlier texts used by Cherubini and Kreutzer in Paris. Stefano Pucitta's *Vestale* (1809) seems to have relied heavily on Spontini's opera of 1807. Some twenty years later, Donizetti and Bellini were often still borrowing from French sources but had begun to have their own special success with a type of spectacle that was peculiarly human and needed few stage accessories: the mad woman.

As Garlington notes, however, the effectiveness of the stage apparatus was usually at least as much responsible for an opera's success as was the music, whether in France, Italy, Germany, or anywhere else. In order to assure the most realistic and impressive sets, theaters sometimes went so far as to send their stage designers abroad to familiarize themselves with the machinery that other theaters had used for similar subjects or to acquire a first-hand acquaintance with the actual locale of a particular subject. Cicéri, the *Opéra's décorateur* for Auber's *La Muette de Portici* (1828), for instance, was sent on such a mission in order to prepare for the opera's final scene, an eruption of Vesuvius. Yet Garlington derives most of his information concerning stage action only from the plots of operas and from stage descriptions included in published scores. He does not concern himself with a systematic review of stage design and spectacle within the period he covers. He includes no pictorial examples of sets or machinery, very little discussion of development and change within the area of stage design, and most disappointingly, no attempt to unravel the relation of composer, librettist, designer, and impresario to each other and to the creation of the marvelous.

Garlington points out a continually growing tendency throughout this period for the composer to write more exciting music for spectacular stage events in order to achieve a more immediate connection between stage and orchestra. He rightly considers an undramatic musical treatment of a fantastic event to be old-fashioned after 1780. Unfortunately, his natural preoccupation with the marvelous often leads him to judge an entire opera on the basis of its use of the marvelous, even though such use sometimes consists of a page or less of music. Some serious exaggerations result. Carafa's *Masaniello* (1827), for instance, on the same subject as Auber's
La Muette and produced only two months prior to Auber’s opera, is dismissed by Garlington as “a complete failure” (p. 192). Yet Loewenberg claims 136 performances for Carafa’s work, hardly a sign of a failure; and the Revue musicale of 1828 mentions several times that the opera was having a long and quite brilliant success.

In a similar comparison between Cherubini’s Lodoiska and Rudolphe Kreutzer’s opera on the same subject, Garlington condemns the Kreutzer work because of its less interesting battle music. He adds that “since this opera was performed scarcely a month following Cherubini’s triumph, Kreutzer obviously had little time to piece the work together if he intended to capitalize on public sympathy for this type of story” (p. 93) and that the attempt to compete with Cherubini’s opera “was as foolhardy an act as can be found in the annals of operatic history” (p. 86). Actually, the two operas were produced exactly fifteen days apart, surely too little time for Kreutzer, librettist, and stage designer to compose an imitation opera that also still needed rehearsal time. Much more likely, the two productions were prepared more or less simultaneously. Moreover, Féris states that Kreutzer’s Lodoiska was received with enthusiasm; and, in fact, it would seem that Kreutzer’s work actually enjoyed a greater success than Cherubini’s, at least in France. In any case, its production was clearly far from being a foolhardy venture.

Garlington’s analyses of the music for stage spectacles often tend to be overly simple, sometimes naive. For example, the music for the marvelous in Cherubini’s Lodoiska and Elisa, Rossini’s Tell, and Marschner’s Vampyr, as well as the storm in Beethoven’s Pastoral Symphony, is each in turn described as being nothing more than an extremely involved development section that has neither exposition nor recapitulation. There are some good reasons why descriptive music for battles, storms, floods, etc., tend to be continuous rather than periodic, but Garlington does not state them.

Despite the occasional oversimplification and exaggeration, however, Garlington has written a basically sound, scholarly, and useful work. There are a few obvious errors of dates and attributions, but these seem to be proofreading slips in a work otherwise well written and carefully prepared. The majority of his ideas are well taken; there is some very thoughtful consideration of the relation of fantasy to Romanticism; and the author is obviously quite familiar with the thorough bibliography he presents. Finally, Garlington makes it clear that a study of “le merveilleux” does, indeed, provide a valid and effective perspective on the rapidly changing ideas and styles of emergent Romanticism.

NOTES

1 Garlington discusses Dittersdorf’s Hieronymus Knicker and mentions Hiller’s Die Jagd, André’s Das wütende Heer, Neele’s Zemire und Azor, Winter’s Unterbrochene Opferfest, and Wranitsky’s Oberon. Unmentioned but among the most successful works dealing with fantasy
or the marvelous are Benda’s melodramas Ariadne auf Naxos and Medea, Winter’s Das Labyrinth, Zumsteg’s Geisterinsel, and Süssmayr’s Spiegel von Arkadien.


4 Revue musicale (1827) 1:574.

5 Alfred Loewenberg, Annals of Opera (Cambridge, 1943), col. 710.

6 2:548, 565, 605. There was clearly a certain amount of competition between the Opéra-Comique (Carafa) and the Opéra (Auber) concerning the production of these two operas. Auber’s work had been scheduled for performance early in 1827 but was continually delayed by the lack of progress of the décorateurs. Reports on their progress in 1827 refer to the opera as “Mazzaniello,” but after it becomes known that Carafa is producing an opera with the same title, Auber’s opera becomes La Muette.


8 Loewenberg, op. cit., col. 491.

Roger Jacques Kamien—The Opening Sonata–Allegro Movements in a Randomly Selected Sample of Solo Keyboard Sonatas Published in the Years 1742–1774

Ann Arbor: University Microfilms (UM order no. 64–9458, 1964. 310 pp. in 2 vols., Princeton University diss.)

Thomas Warburton

Roger Kamien has contributed a valuable service to musicology by showing how one might apply statistical methods to a study of sonata-allegro movements. In his dissertation he has methodically observed specific qualities in a random sample of seventy works. These have been drawn from a total population of 1090 works published between 1742 and 1774. Many previous studies of sonata-allegro movements have involved either the historical evolution of the concept of the sonata in general or the tonal dispersion of musical materials in particular. Kamien, by contrast, has attempted to bridge the gap between the specific and the general.

Having surveyed previous discussions of sonata movements, Kamien observes a lack of objectivity among writers in their descriptions of sonata form. He deplores the inexactness of such terms as “rarely found” or “not uncommon” or “frequently appear” to qualify the occurrence of musical properties. He even refrains from using the term “sonata form” past his second chapter. Through an application of statistical methods, he hopes to determine and describe the incidence of musical events in a more precise language. (In Appendix II he describes the specific technical procedures he has employed.) Further, he attempts to attain a frame of reference with
no limitation to a single composer, group of composers, or specific country. After studying the random sample, he can indicate the changes of style for the total population by means of statistical inference.

Kamien logically and articulately outlines his method. He chooses the dates 1742 and 1774 (inclusive) because they mark C. P. E. Bach's first published solo keyboard sonatas on the one hand and Mozart's first solo keyboard sonatas on the other. Furthermore, he limits his subjects of study to movements in a fast tempo which repeat each of two sections. Accompanied sonatas have been eliminated, as have sonatas by Domenico Scarlatti and works which originally appeared only in anthologies. Kamien admits the obvious limitation "that a random sample may fail to include the most significant works of a period" (p. 32). In an appendix, the author lists the works in his random sample and gives pertinent information about their publication.

As a basis for evaluating change during the period of thirty-two years, he divides the sample at the year 1759, to separate the halves. He then defines cogent compositional gestures that seem indigenous to music of the period. After observing the relative lengths of the two sections, he studies texture, imitation, exchange of voices, phrase structure, and expressive indications. For the first section he particularly emphasizes the so-called "dominant caesura," which he defines as a cessation that "gives special emphasis to a point that roughly corresponds with the beginning of the V area" (p. 56). He is especially interested in measuring the length between the opening of the second section and the return of the first material in the tonic. He qualifies each composition according to these several characteristics and bases his conclusions on the frequency of their occurrence throughout the sample. Occasionally the author relates the music in the sample to the works of Haydn and Mozart.

From his observations, Kamien shows changes in phrase structure, sectional articulation, and harmonic style from the first half of the sample to the second. Few important changes are observed in procedures during the second parts of the movements. In a summary chapter, the author shows the changes in outline form, with page references to the earlier parts of the dissertation.

It is apparent that many characteristics can easily be evaluated quantitatively in a given group of compositions. Indications of dynamic markings or the appearance of a certain kind of texture can be seen and counted precisely. Thus his summary in tabular form, for example, shows the decline of imitation and the increasing disparity of length between the two sections from the earlier works to the later.

Although the systematic procedure leads to definite, substantial conclusions, two problems arise when making generalizations from the study of a random sample. First, not all musical qualities lend themselves completely to treatment by the statistical method. The dominant caesura, for example, depends for its effect on material that surrounds it. Kamien notes that
Mozart writes a dominant caesura in all his sonata-allegro movements except the Sonata in C Major, K. 279 (p. 58 and fn. 27). Such a statement belies the nature of the gesture, for there is one of Mozart's most dramatic moments. After a brief half cadence (m. 16) and a quarter-rest, Mozart introduces the brilliant dominant of the submediant and from there leads to the dominant level through a cycle of progressions by fifths. At this point a dominant caesura provides the foil for the dramatic play of harmonies that follows. Since Kamien makes a quantitative evaluation of such a qualitative gesture as the dominant caesura, he may be overlooking the essence of the musical style.

A second problem stems from the limitation of the sample itself. The author does admit that significant compositions may be excluded; however, a further limitation is apparent in that significant musical gestures may be lacking in works of the sample. A gesture present in a given work of the total studied simply may not appear in any other work of the sample. For instance, Kamien speculates (p. 61) on the possibility that a change of tempo marks the second theme in the exposition. He then makes the following remark (fn. 36): "William Newman's observation [in The Sonata in the Classic Era (Chapel Hill, North Carolina, 1963)] that 'there are not a few freer-type movements in which a complete change of tempo demarcates what would still have to be called the 'second theme'" (pp. 153–54) does not seem to hold true for our population." If Kamien had not had the benefit of previous observations from the Newman study, his sample would not even have shown the possibility of changes of tempo.

Whatever problems he encounters, Kamien has so carefully defined his method and its limits that he can show conclusively that a change of style does take place between 1742 and 1774. The conclusions would seem no less substantial if he had even eliminated those aspects which do not appear to be appropriate for treatment by statistical analysis. The limitation of the statistical method is that it momentarily denies the style of a single composer or the musical character of a single work in deference to a large repertory. Furthermore, using a random sample allows the researcher only relatively accurate conclusions about the total population.

In historical perspective, the sonata-allegro as such remains a dynamic form, a frame for compositional realization. Its very nature defies even an observation of change, since it never seems to become a fixed form. William Newman makes the following observation on page 4 of the above-mentioned book: "Since history is always in transition, any division into periods, however necessary for the sake of easy reference and simplified perspective, is bound to have something of the arbitrary about it." The sonata would offer as many different connotations in the thirty-two years after 1774 as it would in the period under consideration.

Kamien's work may be particularly useful as a working model for similar studies to follow. If the conclusion of the present study were confined to the random sample and not implied for the total population as well, the
problem of unknown quantities outside the sample would be eliminated. Perhaps the study could involve only those elements which have finite qualities. It will be interesting to read from the author and others about further refinements in his method.

Philip Friedheim—*Tonality and Structure in the Early Works of Schoenberg*

Ann Arbor: University Microfilms (UM order no. 64–6464, 1963. 557 pp. in 2 vols., New York University diss.)

**Gregory Proctor**

As the striking developments in music during the late 19th and early 20th centuries recede further in time, more and more musicians are returning to a close examination of the early works of Schoenberg, usually in an attempt to examine the historical processes involved and, perhaps, to separate those elements in modern music which can be seen as the result of a direct historical development from those that are distinctly special to the period. Philip Friedheim’s dissertation deals with this problem.

The dissertation is laid out in three parts. Part One is entitled “The Relationship between Tonality and Structure”; Part Two, “The Early Works of Arnold Schoenberg,” which examines compositions from 1893 to 1908, the time of the first atonal works. Part Three is a conclusion that briefly surveys Schoenberg’s later development. Part One appears in condensed form with many of the examples eliminated in *The Music Review* (1966) 27: 44–53, and is, to my mind, one of the most interesting sections of the dissertation. It concerns itself with motivic transformation and melodically motivic sonorities in the works of Brahms, Wagner, and Strauss.

Friedheim’s thesis is that certain methods of organizing musical material that can be found in tonal compositions begin to predominate in music written under the influence of declining tonality. Such devices are: motivic variation and transformation, and the combining of variously transformed motives into highly contrapuntal complexes; characteristic sonorities that give color to a work but do not represent a tonic in any classical sense; and harmonic devices, such as multiple interpretation of chords, including the variety of possible roots by supposition, enharmonic equivalents, and abbreviation of “functional” progressions by the omission of a typical chord, usually the dominant. All of the above go hand in hand with ambiguity and may be seen in relation to the classical tonal style as either contributors to, or results of, the weakening of the tonal system. The course
of the dissertation follows this development in a historic fashion, starting with predecessors of Schoenberg and continuing through his Opus 11.

In the discussion of Schoenberg’s predecessors, Friedheim makes a useful distinction between thematic development and thematic transformation (pp. 13 ff.). The transformation concept is illustrated by examples from Brahms and includes an elaborated version of Schoenberg’s observations on the Fourth Symphony in Style and Idea. (It might be worth mentioning that the “rhythmic alteration” method of transformation is old, being the essential technique of the Baroque variation suite.) There are also examples from Wagner, with some excellent demonstrations of motivic interrelatedness. The significance of these predecessors to Friedheim is evident from such statements as: “Tristan und Isolde represents the point in the history of tonality where the expressive element becomes so dominant that the harmony no longer supports the form . . . The structure of the music now lies more within the vast complex of interrelated themes than anywhere else” (p. 39). The relation of this view to Schoenberg’s development is apparent; however, it remains to be shown where in Schoenberg’s works this same principle operates on a basic level and where it does not—but where a form-creating tonic emphasis is still present.

In Part Two, at the beginning of each group of works examined, Friedheim carefully discusses chronology and suggests alternatives to Rufer’s catalogue. This is welcome in that Rufer groups members of the same opus together, whereas Friedheim separates these members and balances dates on manuscripts against internal evidence to arrive at his ordering of the composition of the pieces. I hope that Friedheim might see fit to gather these chronological observations together into an article in order to make this information more generally available to interested readers.

Here and there in the course of the dissertation, Friedheim provides lists of errors he has found in various scores. All such lists are useful in helping to clear up the errors abounding in Schoenberg scores. One of his corrections, however, is probably a mere typographical error: “Op. 8, no. 1 . . . 5–2 1st vla., 2nd note should be a D” (p. 248); Friedheim must have meant to say it should be a C#. (An additional error in this opus that Friedheim failed to catch is in the vocal score of Op. 8, No. 2; m. 8, second beat, left hand: A# instead of A.)

The author traces the growth of certain techniques in Schoenberg’s early works. An example is his discussion of the main chord in the prelude to Gurrelieder, E♭-B♭-C-E♭-G-C. This chord acts as a non-standard tonic sonority. It is an indication that this piece will make free use of the whole step as a stable sonority. Friedheim is especially interested here, however, in the use of this chord to create a continuing aura of uncertainty, and as a source for both harmonic and melodic material. Another example of new technique is his citing of symmetrical, non-classically-tonal sonorities in Pelleas und Melisande, specifically, two augmented triads adding up to a whole-tone scale, and four-note chords in fourths.
The unerring path to atonality is traced through such operations, as that employed in *Traumleben*, Op. 6, No. 1, which is otherwise a rather straightforward song (p. 251): "The melodic movement of the E♯ to B♯ rather than to F♯ produces the outline of an F-major triad A–F(E♯)–C(B♯), although this chord does not appear in the accompaniment. The melodic propensity to leap to and from nonharmonic notes characterizes the writing of this period and often imparts to certain passages the suggestion of bitetonic."

At one point Friedheim shows an interesting correspondence between Schoenberg's speculation in his *Harmonielehre* and a composition written some years earlier, the song *Ghasel*, Op. 6, No. 5. The passage from *Harmonielehre* is entitled "Bässe zum verminderten 7-Akkord" and is concerned with Example 304. (I hesitate to use page numbers here, as my copy has this material beginning on page 411 while Friedheim lists page 444.) The original idea, that of "supposing" a series of different roots to a diminished-seventh chord, is extended in *Harmonielehre* to the process of outlining a diminished-seventh chord in scalar form by interpolating notes between the chord members in a consistent fashion so that the added notes themselves form a diminished-seventh chord. There are thus two scales for each "main" diminished-seventh chord. This is the so-called "octatonic" scale and is used extensively in Stravinsky's *Fireworks*, composed at about the same time as the Schoenberg song. An earlier example is found in Tchaikovsky's Sixth Symphony, first movement, mm. 271–74. Schoenberg, however, carries the idea yet further in *Harmonielehre* and in the song to include the accompanying of a diminished-seventh chord by the octatonic scale with which it shares no members; he thereby presents the entire chromatic scale in a well-defined way and in short order. This is one example of a distinctly modern approach, not derived from classical tradition or tendencies. It involves symmetrical relations between tone complexes and further includes the "tonal" concept of chord prolongation, but with a decidedly non-classical tonal procedure.

Friedheim contends that Schoenberg was continually facing the problem of structure in large works and attempting new solutions. He wonders whether a large structure "necessitated a conscious harmonic simplification" (p. 325). He indicates one solution as applied to the *Kammersymphonie*, Op. 9, in which Schoenberg employs the form-supporting devices of: (1) preservation of thematic character (contrast), (2) relative harmonic stability within an advanced chromatic style (whole-tone scale inside an E-major harmonic background), (3) sonority (chords in fourths as a type of punctuation), and (4) variation and contrapuntal combination of themes.

Eventually we are led to the situation occurring in the last movement of the Quartet, Op. 10, for which Friedheim refers to chords that "represent momentary harmonic oasis within an atonal desert. Thus it is not a specific tonality but a sonority or pitch sequence that appears at the recapitulation" (p. 393).

Some good and welcome observations about rhythm are made with refer-
ence to the atonal style. He says on page 431: "Tonal harmony, rooted in the functioning bass and the cadential progression, demands a rhythm based on patterned repetitions. Atonal music, freed from the forward motion of the bass and the harmonic drive toward resolution, loses the necessity for a downbeat. The downbeat is, after all, not so much the place for an accent as for a harmonic resolution."

The suggestion of rhythm as a primary formal element (thus serving a new role in atonal music) is indicated by Friedheim's discussion of the first part of Op. 11, No. 2. "If one views the passage as a single curve, moving first toward rhythmic clarification, and then away from it, the entire fifteen-bar unit becomes directed. Thus, one is not dealing with the development of rhythmic motives, i.e., with thematic material, but with the relative degree to which the patterns support or destroy a fundamental pulse" (p. 460). (In this connection, see Friedheim's article "Rhythmic Structure in Schoenberg's Atonal Compositions," *JAMS* [1966] 19: 59-72.)

Another rhythmic distinction is made when Friedheim indicates that the early works of Schoenberg are easily shown to be derived from the Romantic tradition. Serial music on the other hand "functions as a neo-classic element within Schoenberg's fundamentally Romantic *Weltanschauung*" (p. 56). It might be well to point out that this characteristic is reflected in the varied rhythmic complexity of the pieces. The "post-Romantic" and atonal works are in general more convoluted rhythmically, as though perhaps to counteract the disappearing subtlety of the rhythmic effect of harmonic progression in a classically tonal composition as compared to the generally undifferentiated flow of relatively dissonant harmonies in these works. But when Schoenberg enters the realm of twelve-tone composition, he is satisfied that he has discovered an alternative to tonality, one which, presumably, need not reflect the flow of traditional music but has its own unique type of motion, for Schoenberg's rhythm immediately reverts to simpler patterns contributing to the "motoristic" drive of a piece but not to the breathing effect of older music. The basic rhythms are universal, the flow is stylistic, and Schoenberg is no longer interested in preserving the rhythmic effect of a fundamentally different style.

The title of the dissertation is perhaps misleading in its emphasis on tonality, insofar as Friedheim's actual descriptions of pieces are more concerned with motivic analyses in the sense of repetition, transformations and inversion, etc., than with pitch structures *per se*. When harmonic points are described it is usually with reference to a peculiar detail outside the context of the phrase, much less the entire work, so that instead of considerations of tonality there are those of chord succession. Unless one considers the total environment of an interesting or peculiar detail, questions of tonality are inappropriate. And so Friedheim misses an opportunity to make some valuable distinctions of systematics in Schoenberg's early music. He is, therefore, also unable to delineate any essential trend or transformation technique in a sufficiently specific and thorough manner. This problem is, perhaps, the
result of attempting to deal with every composition of the most prolific period of the composer’s life. More information might well have been gained through a total analysis of what Friedheim considers the most representative or significant works for demonstrating his thesis.

The question of tonality is, in fact, the weak point of the dissertation. Near the beginning the author quotes, and apparently endorses, a definition of tonality given by Delbert M. Beswick in his Ph.D. dissertation, “The Problem of Tonality in Seventeenth Century Music” (University of North Carolina, 1950): “Tonality is the organized relationship of musical sounds, as perceived and interpreted with respect to some central point of reference that seems to coordinate the separate items and events and to lend them meaning as component parts of a unified whole” (Beswick, p. 18; Friedheim, p. 4).

Despite its lack of affirmation this can be a workable description, if not a definition, of tonality in its broadest sense. But a fundamental distinction between “common practice” tonality and “expanded” tonality is not made in any systematic way, and this is the very rock upon which copious learned argument founders. A reference to “fundamental bass” as the primary constituent of classical tonality will not suffice, not only because of the inherently untheoretical, incomplete, and undefined nature of this Rameau-oriented theory, but because it is easily countered by examples which can be produced, nearly at will, from almost any arbitrary selection of pieces that are twelve-tone or generally admitted to be non-tonal in the classical sense, and which nevertheless contain fundamental-bass progressions of, for instance, perfect fifths. The derivation of these progressions is no less tortured than those common in this dissertation or in the “Extended Tonality” section of Piston’s Harmony. An obvious example of this technique is found in the second song of Schoenberg’s Opus 15, from its beginning to the downbeat of measure 5, wherein fundamental-bass progressions of an ascending series of perfect fifths can be discerned easily. Friedheim would surely agree that this piece had little in common technically with a piece of Beethoven, but the precise nature of the difference is not told, and it seems that this could properly be the main point of investigation of a dissertation bearing a title like this one.

The distinction between a broad and narrow definition of tonality must not, of course, be confused with the possibility of the presence in a piece of a characteristic sonority which cannot, for reasons of context and, perhaps, traditional knowledge, be taken as a non-triadic tonic. Such an example is the “Tristan” chord, and Friedheim discusses this problem on pages 42 and 43. Here he indicates that he recognizes a distinction between tonality in general and classical tonality in particular, but he fails to make use of this awareness for the balance of the dissertation. In Friedheim’s assessment of a work’s adherence to tonality, too much seems to depend on whether or not that work begins and ends in the same key. Tonality is a very complex set of possibilities and is not defined by the specific type of elements in a piece or by
any detail of connection of sonorities, but rather by what may be heard to lie behind the piece, that sound from which every other event can be shown to be derived, either directly (e.g., V), or through the medium of derivations from derivations (e.g., V of V). A piece may consist entirely of triads and not be tonal, or it may be tonal but not in the classical manner. The classical manner should have been defined tightly so that the non-classical could be distinguished more easily.

To be sure, the source for Friedheim in his harmonic terminology is Schoenberg himself, whose observations on the subject are found in Harmonielehre and in The Structural Functions of Harmony. These theories themselves grow out of a stream of 19th-century thought which derives from Rameau and includes the still pervasive influence of Riemann. Friedheim’s analyses are thus well legitimatized in that they follow the style used by Schoenberg in the analysis of his own works. But do Schoenberg’s attitudes toward analysis reflect what is really needed in the field to enlighten and inform others in a way that, hopefully, relates to how people hear music or can learn to hear music?

An example of the pitfalls of this kind of theory crops up when Friedheim discusses the song Erwartung, Op. 2, No. 1. About the opening measure he writes: “This passage sometimes appears in textbooks as an example of a non-functioning appoggiatura chord. It can, however, be interpreted as an altered supertonic ninth without the root. The E♭ acts as a tonic pedal, and the other notes must be arranged in order (F)-A-C♯-E♭-G♭” (p. 98). This statement has a footnote appended: “Although this particular alteration of a II♭ chord appears extreme, it is listed in Schoenberg’s Harmonielehre (Vienna 1911) p. 401 Ex. 298 last chord” (p. 98). Overlooking Schoenberg’s failure to include an example of the use of this chord without the root, this writer presumes that Friedheim’s preference for naming it an altered II♭ rather than an altered IV♭7 depends on Schoenberg’s omission of such a chord in his list of altered seventh chords. In any case, what information is supplied by such a label? And what can a non-functioning chord be in any case? It cannot mean that the piece would be essentially the same without it. Is not an appoggiatura a note which functions? Would an appoggiatura chord not be one in which all members functioned as appoggiaturas? Does the discovery of a functioning chord in Friedheim’s sense mean that there is a change in the basic harmony from a chord to its resolution? If so, is that not counteracted, in this case, by the pedal tone and the absence of the root? And what is the difference, after all, between a II♭ chord and a IV chord, and, by extension, a II♭9 and IV♭7, if it is not that the specific presence of the root of the II chord bears a melodic association with both the tonic and mediant tones and supplies in advance a fifth for the dominant chord, a “function” unfulfillable by the IV chord? In fact, what does “dominant function” involve if not the contrapuntal operations of arpeggiation, passing, and/or neighbor tones? Does a listener hear “note names” regardless of chromatic disguises? If an analyst were primarily interested in vertical configurations
per se, would it not be wise for him to ponder the differences and similarities between chords of the same notes (by name) as well as of different notes?

Consistent with the problems created by Schoenberg's theoretical syntax is the by now comical issue of the fourth inversion of a ninth chord in Verklärte Nacht. Friedheim says (p. 119): "Despite Schoenberg's own analysis of this construction, the question still remains as to whether a ninth can be placed in the bass and still maintain its harmonic meaning?" What is its harmonic meaning when the ninth is not in the bass? Is it the same for all pieces? Suppose, for the sake of argument, that it retained its harmonic meaning in this case. Would either the construction of the piece or the hearing of it change? Would information be provided by that fact, or does the simple succession of four chords with each part moving unerringly by half step render the whole argument senseless?

Another basic consideration of this syntax, and one heavily employed by Friedheim, is the concept of supposition of roots to chords to form more conventional patterns than would appear from the notes actually present. Indeed, Friedheim reads a characteristic of the decline of the strength of the tonal system in the possibility of manifold root suppositions for a single chord. This characteristic is an essential point in his thesis in that it introduces ambiguity. "These two factors, the dissolution of the harmonic rhythm and the merging of separate root functions, ultimately deal the death blow to tonality" (p. 243).

This attitude is the basis for analyses like the following concerning Op. 8, No. 2: "The first diminished-seventh chord G-B♭-D♭(C♯)-F♯(E) has an E♭ as the root actually sounding in the bass. Then, with the E♭ remaining, the chord becomes a V₉ on an implied F♯, i.e., (F♯)-A♭-C♯-E-G, and resolves to B-major. The E♭ in the bass has become a D♯, an anticipation of the major third of the B chord. Its continued presence in the first bar, however, considerably obscures the function of the implied F♯" (p. 249). Note how Friedheim, following Schoenberg's syntax, arrives at a solution to the passage that entails hearing an implied tone that the composer himself fights in the music. If an analysis is to have any relation to what is heard, why cannot the diminished-seventh chords be heard as the simple, symmetrical, chromatic structures that they are, capable, because of their likely appearance in multiple situations, of multiple resolutions? When such a chord is heard, the listener may have a guess as to where the tones might go, but it is an ambiguous sound until it actually moves. In a highly chromatic environment, it is unlikely that the listener will or should have very specific expectations as to the resolution of any chord. This is one of the reasons that such chromatic sonorities and their distant resolutions have so much more power in Classic than in Romantic music.

Another pitfall of the analyst is exemplified in a passage on Gurrelieder (p. 151) where Friedheim says: "The diminished-seventh chord functions as a V₉ without the root. The sustained note D can also be interpreted as the dominant of the Neapolitan, a progression established in the preceding song."
It can be, but why? The D in fact moves down a half step to become the first note of the tune. Why is the description “dominant of the Neapolitan” (which does not appear here) more informative than a connective motive of a descending half step? Function should refer to what the tones do, not to how they might be labeled irrespective of the music under scrutiny.

What develops here is the establishment of a classification system which purports to be analysis. Relationships are established between chord classes on a hypothetical basis. Notes that appear in a piece of music are then given names that correspond to the relations set forth in such tables as those by Erpf or Schoenberg. In this way the analyst is in fact describing his system of classification without reference to the composition.

One other harmonic feature that Friedheim leans on heavily is the abbreviated cadence, specifically proceeding from a pre-dominant-type chord directly to the tonic without the intervening dominant. Schoenberg discusses this procedure, “Kurzung von Wendungen durch Weglassung des Wegs,” on page 403 of the Harmonielehre. A particularly strong example is in Die Aufgeregten, Op. 3, No. 2: “The D\(_7\) at the end becomes a V of II and the main body of the song follows in F minor, thus omitting two intervening chords, the supertonic and the dominant” (p. 239).

Schoenberg could well have been using this device consciously, precisely where and in the way that Friedheim points it out, but, again, the rather direct contrapuntal connection between the two chords is ignored. Yet, that this intention is a real fact of the hearing of such music is questionable, even given Friedheim’s warning that “any extreme use of this technique, however, will result in tonal obscurity” (p. 107).

Perhaps the point concerning the newness of procedures might have been better made by substituting the simple idea of counterpoint within chromatic rather than diatonic constraints for the concepts of conflicting implied roots and multiple interpretations, and of abbreviation. Thus, triads may move effectively to many other triads in the most unusual fashion. The composers of the first half of this century were deeply involved in a polyphonic style; thus one may readily expect fascination on their part with the varieties of movement of each individual voice in a chord. In such a case unusual progressions need not be viewed as abbreviations of conventional progressions but as examples of a fresh outlook on chords in their simplest contrapuntal associations. From this point of view, the music of the early 20th century has much in common with the experiments in intense chromaticism of the last part of the 16th century. In both cases, the chromatic scale is the primary assumption and the concept of chords related by consonance to the tonic as structural goals of motion is of no consideration. This attitude would also substitute minimal expectations for the conflicting multiple expectations of Friedheim’s approach. It should be noted that Friedheim himself seems willing to treat the sonorities this way when the chords are less frequently specific triads, as in the works described as “atonal” and parts of those immediately preceding.
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The strengths of this dissertation lie, then, in the historically oriented survey of Schoenberg’s predecessors and in the discussions of his own early music, especially with reference to questions of motivic manipulation contributing to clarity in a time of the clouding of tonality. What is weak is the style of harmonic analysis, which, though hoary, seems not to be particularly helpful in distinguishing the stages of tonal development from the classical tonal style to serialism and the utter dominance of the chromatic scale. Much of the blame belongs to Schoenberg himself, of course, as he seemed to be of that traditional breed of musicians who treat music theory as a mystical branch of knowledge concerned with divining relations that do not have much to do with what music sounds like or how it is composed. One is tempted to entertain the notion that Schoenberg was throwing up a smoke screen designed to cover the fact that he really was doing something new after all.

NOTES

1 Hermann Erpf, Studien zur Harmonie= und Klangtechnik der neueren Musik (Leipzig, 1927), p. 32.