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Abstract:
In textural density and thematic development, it is generally agreed that Alban Berg's (1885–1935) Opus 6 orchestral pieces (1914–15)—Praeludium, Reigen, and Marsch—are the most complex music in his output. In order to understand these works better, the thesis examines documents from the composer's Nachlass. Berg's compositional process is discussed, his sketchbooks reconstructed and selectively transcribed, and his textual revisions given critical commentary. Nachlass materials clarify the relation between Opus 6 and other items from this period (Op.4, Op.5, the Symphonic-Fragmente, and the earliest sketches for Wozzeck), document the Berg-Schoenberg relationship, suggest programmatic contents (Berg's Reigen seems based on Arthur Schnitzler's play), and account for the early performance and publication history. It is maintained that sketch and Particell documents provide clues to, and corroborating support for, analytical interpretations. The principal analytical tools employed in the study are: structural voice-leading (Schenkerian) analysis, atonal pitch-class set analysis, and the analysis of formal function. The chapter divisions are: (1) Introduction: a Praeludium on matters of purpose, procedure, and plan; (2) The Composition of Opus 6: "ein Entstehungsreigen"; (3) A March through the Documents; (4) Praeludium: "composing between the tones"; (5) Reigen: blocks, chains, and cycles; sonority, theme, and form; (6) "Interlude": performance and publication history of Opus 6; and (7) Marsch eines Asthma-克ers: a documentary and analytical study.
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1 Introduction: a Präludium on matters of purpose, procedure, and plan

Purpose:

The present study is the first full-length documentary and analytical investigation of Alban Berg’s only purely orchestral work, the Three Pieces for Orchestra, Opus 6. The purpose of the study is twofold: it provides a detailed analysis of the musical structure of the individual pieces—Präludium, Reigen, Marsch [“Prelude, Round-Dance, March”]; and it provides a thorough examination of Berg’s compositional process as revealed in the musical documents pertaining to Opus 6 that are found in the composer’s Nachlaß [estate]—sketches, Particell, autograph score, etc. In particular, it is shown that such documents can provide clues to, and corroborating support for, analytical readings of the pieces—which are, in many respects, the most complex and challenging works that Berg produced.

In the more substantial works of his relatively small output, Alban Berg (1885–1935) left the remarkable legacy of having composed only ‘masterworks’: there is something original, authentic, and masterful in every work from the Piano Sonata, Op.1, to the Cerha-restored Lulu. The ‘romantic’ qualities of Berg’s sonorous aesthetic attract some and put off others, but beneath the passionate surface lies a methodological obsessiveness that can be disclosed only through detailed analysis of the scores. There is even a
deliberateness to the sequence of genres from Opus 1 to Opus 7: piano sonata, songs with piano, string quartet, songs with orchestra, solo instrumental pieces (for clarinet) with piano, symphonic orchestral pieces, opera. After Wozzeck, Berg adopted Schoenberg's twelve-tone method and in part revisited, in part extended his exploration of genres with a concerted chamber work (for piano, violin, and thirteen winds), a suite of pieces for string quartet, a concert aria for soprano and orchestra, a violin concerto, and a twelve-tone opera that includes a film-interlude.¹

Berg remains best-known as the composer of Wozzeck, as the plaque affixed to his Viennese residence attests. In recent years, productions of Lulu in the version restored and completed by Friedrich Cerha have further enhanced Berg's reputation as an opera composer. Amongst his other works, the Violin Concerto and the Lyric Suite (both no doubt helped along by their programmatic aspects) have considerable popularity with audiences and players and are regularly programmed in circles not exclusively dedicated to the performance of "contemporary" music. The Piano Sonata and the songs (mostly the Seven Early Songs, but also Opus 2—at least in analysis classes!), even the ensemble-difficult Clarinet Pieces, have become sufficiently familiar in idiom that they are now commonly undertaken by student professionals.

Berg's music received a 'publicity boost' from centennial celebrations in 1985, and it now profits from the democratizing potential offered by wide dissemination of recordings in compact disc. In a context that now sees many orchestras (even the student orchestra at McGill University) entertain complete Mahler-symphony cycles in concert hall and recorded performance, can Berg's Three Pieces for Orchestra be far behind? Opus 6 is already regularly programmed by major symphony orchestras and there are several recorded performances available.
My initial and continuing motivation for this study has been my interest in the pieces themselves, in the way they hang together so convincingly, even in places where I suspect them flawed. I decided to approach Opus 6 in particular because it addresses head on, indeed, it enacts, the central problem of twentieth-century musical syntax: how to achieve large-scale formal design in a non-triadic-tonal universe. I expected extreme analytical challenges, but I did not prevision the immense bibliographical difficulties that the musical documents would pose, nor did I anticipate the biographical centrality of Opus 6 in the Berg-Schoenberg relationship.

Concerning the biographical ramifications, we shall see that Opus 6, as process and product, was Berg's statement of independence from Schoenberg. For, if the Altenberglieder, Op.4 and the Clarinet Pieces, Op.5 (as the first works written outside of formal instruction) engendered Schoenberg's censure, Opus 6 engendered his silence. Schoenberg, great teacher that he surely was, pushed Berg not only to technical but also to artistic and personal independence, and this process culminated in crisis for Berg at the time of Opus 6. Wozzeck, initial ideas for which were sketched while the Opus 6 pieces were still being composed, faced a ten-year maturation before its 1925 premiere put Berg on the slow catapult to independent fame and 'overnight success'.

Concerning the bibliographical challenges, we shall see that the sketches for Opus 6 are intertwined not only with those for Wozzeck but also with sketches hitherto unexplored for the Clarinet Pieces, op.5, and the Altenberglieder, op.4. Moreover, documentation for Opus 6 must be compared with that for Berg's two abandoned orchestral works from this period, the Passacaglia-Fragment and the Symphonie-Fragment. Overall, however, the central challenge of any work with Berg's sketches lies in the generally indecipherable quality of his handwriting. Native German speakers
have considerable initial advantage, but compositional experience proves almost more valuable than German skills. Eventually, one develops a certain expertise with the idiosyncrasies of Berg's hand; better yet, cooperative effort amongst the knowledgeable occasionally produces surprising breakthroughs. But sometimes it seems that no amount of intermittent staring at Berg's enigmatic scrawl can force it to magically coalesce into any meaningful word or placeable motive. Under such circumstances, those familiar with the transcriptive difficulties are apt to consider most efforts provisional—and they should do so in this study as well.

Finally, concerning an assessment of the impact of the pieces—their particular importance in Berg's output and the analytical challenges they pose—we have the testimony of three well-known Berg scholars: Mark DeVoto, Douglas Jarman, and George Perle. All three have made important contributions to our understanding of Opus 6, though only DeVoto has shown extensive interest in both its documentary and analytical aspects.

The motivic complexity of Berg's music reaches its height in the Three Orchestral Pieces op.6 ... . In both their textural density and their handling of thematic development the op.6 Orchestral Pieces, and especially the final 'Marsch', are, perhaps, the most complex music in Berg's output. (Jarman 1979, 37 and 42)

If it is possible in the Drei Orchesterstücke, to trace, as various authors have done, the psychological root of Berg the dramatist, it is all the more possible to trace forward the development of Berg the architect, the development from Berg's earliest works, from the first Lieder onwards, and to pursue a direct line form the Piano Sonata, op.1, through the Quartet, op.3 to the Three Pieces. All are large-scale works, whose structures are determined by the intensive working up of a small number of melodic components; in other words: they are all thoroughly-goingly thematic, in which the thematic process now and then spills over into every aspect of the musical texture. ... But it is the Drei Orchesterstücke, in which Berg powerfully developed the thematic art of his compositional technique. (DeVoto 1980, 98)
Above all, the significance for Berg's subsequent development of Reigen, the Marsch, and the Altenberg Lieder passacaglia [op.4, no.5] is that in these three movements he discovered the essential role that traditional forms and traditional stylistic details could play in restoring the possibility of coherent large-scale structure which the dissolution of the classical tonal system had destroyed. For Berg this restoration was a pressing need, whose conditions he worked out independently almost a decade before Schoenberg resolved the same problem for himself in the principles of the twelve-tone system. (Perle 1980, 17)

If the Three Pieces is, in a sense, retrogressive, coming as it does after Schoenberg's Five Pieces for Orchestra, Erwartung, and Pierrot lunaire, and after Berg's own Altenberg Lieder and the clarinet and piano pieces, it was nevertheless essential preparation for the composition of Wozzeck [and for its musico-dramatic conception]. ... Essential elements of the musical idiom to serve that conception were evolved by Berg in the Three Pieces for Orchestra. (Perle 1980, 13)

George Perle calls the Three Pieces “in a sense [a] retrogressive” work. That description seems not quite right; “retrospective” would be a better term, referring to the backward glances at Mahler, and to the overwrought, decaying splendor of the prewar Austro-Hungarian Empire. In every other sense, the Three Pieces, the Marsch, in particular, are a progressive work, achieving a height of textural complexity never again approached by Berg and only seldom approached since by any other composer. (DeVoto 1984, 44 and 46)

We conclude this introductory statement of purpose with one final entry in this appeal ad verecundiam. Everyone who comes to Opus 6 is given pause by the following comments of Igor Stravinsky:

If I were able to penetrate the barrier of style (Berg’s [to Stravinsky] radically alien emotional climate) I suspect he would appear to me as the most gifted constructor in form of the composers of this century. He transcends even his own most overt modelling. In fact, he is the only one to have achieved large-scale development-type forms without a suggestion of ‘neo-classic’ dissimulation.

... the essence of his work is thematic structure, and the thematic structure is responsible for the immediacy of the form. However, complex, however, ‘mathematical’ the latter are, they are always ‘free’ thematic forms born of ‘pure feeling’ and ‘expression’. The perfect work in which to study this, and, I think, the essential work, with Wozzeck, for the study of all of his music, is the the Three Pieces for Orchestra, op.6. (Stravinsky 1959, 71–72)
Procedure:

The twofold documentary and analytical purpose of this study requires parallel processing. The next sections of this chapter deal with these aspects separately. First, I review the state of Berg documentary research: this is subdivided into biographical studies, catalogues and editions, Berg’s writings and analyses, Berg’s correspondence, and collections of scholarly essays. My review is not intended to be an exhaustive examination of Berg research, much of which is in any case only peripherally relevant to Opus 6; rather, it seeks to establish the historical and contemporary contexts in which the present study is undertaken.²

Second, I review analytical approaches to Berg’s music: this includes general surveys and studies of individual works (some of the latter refer to Nachlaß documents). In a separate third section, special attention is given to analytical studies of Opus 6; and the opportunity is taken to explain some of the extensions and refinements of the work of others made in the present study. Fourth, in the context of the preceding, I explain the approach of this study: the documentary approach is considered first; followed by the analytical approach. The documentary component of this section explains my approach to the inventory of Opus-6-related documents and my procedures in presenting selected items in facsimile and transcription. The analytical component, though generally synthetic in approach, is distilled into three complementary tools: structural voice-leading, pitch-class set theory, and the analysis of formal function. The general methodological backgrounds of these tools, as well as their particular applications in this study, are considered separately. Finally, the last portion of this introductory chapter lays out the plan of the chapters which follow.
Berg Documentary Research

This review of Bergiana is subdivided into biographical studies, catalogues and editions, the composer’s writings and analyses, the composer’s correspondence, and collections of scholarly essays. The limitations and purpose of this review have been noted above.

Biographical studies. The early, and often obfuscating, reportage of Berg’s “official” inner-circle biographer, Willi Reich (1898–1980; Reich 1937, and 1963, trans. 1965), was vastly extended by the more critical assessment of Hans Ferdinand Redlich (1903–1968; Redlich 1957a, with its quite incomplete translation 1957b). Then, from 1965, Berg’s published letters to his wife (Helene Berg, née Nahowski, 1885–1976) became the most important biographical resource for Berg research (Berg 1965, abridged trans. 1971). The letters, which though copious are nonetheless selected, were published with Frau Berg’s approval—and sometimes with her active ‘deletorial’ intervention.

The next monograph was again by an inner-circle member, the renowned social philosopher and Berg’s former composition student, Theodor Wiesengrund Adorno (1903–1969; Adorno 1968; trans. 1991). Due perhaps to the recent publication of the letters and to his natural preferences, Adorno’s work eschews biographical survey; instead, it is a personal reflection and reminiscence adjoined to a series of analytical essays. The latter, though far from rigorous, are regularly peppered with brilliant metaphorical insights.

Two collections of photographs and biographical documents appeared in the 1970s, one by Volker Scherliess (1975), the other by the composer’s nephew, Erich Alban Berg (1905–1988; E.A. Berg 1976). And two more “popular” life and works surveys also appeared in English (Carner 1975, rev.1983, and Monson 1979). As Douglas Jarman (1991) notes, a decent critical biography of Berg remains to be written. In the interim, however,
biographical studies of Schoenberg (Stuckenschmidt 1974, trans. 1977; by no means exhaustive) and Webern (Moldenhauer 1979, remarkably detailed) shed much indirect light on Berg and his role in the New Viennese triumvirate. In a different manner, a similar service is provided by Joan Allen Smith's juxtaposition of oral history and explanatory commentary in her engaging "portrait" of the Schoenberg Circle (Smith 1986).

In Berg's centennial year, Erich Berg (1985) produced a second biographical portfolio that included an early draft biography (by Berg's childhood friend Hermann Watznauer), additional correspondence (including some with Gottfried Kassowitz relevant to Opus 6), and some "due supplements" to the Berg biography. The last include further family anecdotes, as well as information on Berg's illegitimate daughter Albine Schucl Wittula (1902–1954) and on the likelihood that Helene Berg was herself an illegitimate daughter of Kaiser Franz Josef. Such material could only be published after Helene Berg's death.

Catalogues and editions. With the death of Helene Berg in 1976 (30–08–1976) a new era in Berg research began. Berg's extensive Nachlaß became more accessible to scholars. Most of the material is now housed in the music collection of the Austrian National Library (A-Wn), some in the Wiener Stadt- und Landesbibliothek (A-Wst), though parts of Berg's legacy remain scattered widely. For example, the autograph score and the fair copy of Opus 6 are now found in the Lehman and Cary collections of the Pierpont Morgan Library (US-NYpm) in New York. The new level of reliance on primary sources may be seen in Rosemary Hilmar's (1978) documentation of Berg's life up to the time of Wozzeck.

Hilmar's subsequent catalogue of the musical sources in the Nachlaß at the Nationalbibliothek, though perhaps understandably inaccurate in many of its details, represents a milestone in Berg documentary research (R. Hilmar
1980; reviews Szmolyan 1979 [sic], Fisk 1980, Spies 1981, Stenzl 1981, Jarman 1981). Items Hilmar lists for Opus 6 and for the other works around it are more thoroughly examined here. Hilmar's second catalogue (R. Hilmar 1985a; review Jarman 1986) lists the non-musical documents of the Nachlaß. Several of these items are germane to Opus 6: Berg's correspondence with his editorial assistants and with performers, his notebooks and diaries, as well as contracts, travel papers, and documents relating to his work for the Verein. Finally, the catalogue Hilmar produced for a centenary exhibition in Vienna (23-05 to 20-10-1985) compiles a wealth of information in text, photographs, and facsimiles (R. Hilmar 1985b).

Both of the Nachlaß catalogues (as Alban Berg Studien, volumes 1/1 and 1/2, respectively) were published by Universal Edition and the Alban Berg Stiftung. Amongst its numerous ventures, the Stiftung [Foundation], which now occupies Berg's Trauttmansdorffgasse flat, oversees the "historical-critical complete edition" of Berg's works that is now in progress under the editorial leadership of Rudolf Stephan. The goal of the edition is to gather together in one series Berg's mature musical compositions, early works, and writings on music. The plan is to replace, with corrections and proper critical apparatus, those editions of Berg's music brought out by Universal Edition during the composer's lifetime and in the 1950s and 1960s.

The first item to appear in the collected works was a designated "Separatum" to the projected series subdivision on orchestral works. This was Stephan's edition in fine colour facsimile of the Symphonie-Fragmente (Berg 1984; review Taylor 1986). The Symphonie-Fragment and the Passacaglia-Fragment that accompanies it in the edition were compositional projects abandoned by Berg just prior to his settling on Opus 6. Determining their relation to Opus 6 is, therefore, an important 'sidebar' to our study. (Description of the fragments is folded into the story of the composition of
Opus 6 which is told in Chapter 2.) As of 1996, only the volume of Berg’s writings edited by Rudolf Stephan and Regina Busch has appeared. (Though Christopher Hailey’s edition of early song should find its way into the juvenilia section of the works, and Mark DeVoto’s edition of the Altenberglieder should soon be forthcoming.) DeVoto has been designated the editor for the “orchestral works” subdivision of the complete edition which will include Berg’s arrangements of Strauss’s Wein, Weib und Gesang and his Three Pieces from the Lyric Suite for String Orchestra, as well as Opus 6. It is expected that the sketch studies and text-critical observations of the present work will be of value to the projected new edition.

**Berg’s Writings and Analyses.** Berg wrote extensively on music, mostly on Schoenberg’s music, and these analytical writings tell us much about Berg’s conception of musical discourse. For example, Berg’s Anbruch article, “Warum ist Schönbergs Musik so schwer verständlich?” (1924; reprinted in Reich 1963, 179-193; trans. in Reich 1965, 189-204) contains a good synopsis of those many features of Schoenberg’s music that Berg not only catalogued as an analyst but also emulated as a composer: multiplicity in harmony, multi-level definition of cadence, unsymmetrical construction of themes, variation of theme and harmony, polyphony extending over the whole work, inimitable contrapuntal technique, diversity and differentiation of rhythms (Reich 1965, 202; our is listing a close paraphrase of Berg).

Most informative for the present study were Berg’s analytical concert guides for Schoenberg’s Gurrelieder (large format 1913, small format 1914), Pelleas and Melisande (1920) and particularly for the Chamber Symphony (1918). All three have recently appeared in reprint in the collected works volume mentioned above (Berg 1994) and are also available in parallel translation in a special double issue of the *Journal of the Arnold Schoenberg*
In addition, the Nachlaß contains Berg's studies with Schoenberg in harmony, counterpoint, and composition; and it contains Berg's annotated copies of Schoenberg's scores. Berg's harmony studies (1906–07) follow the pedagogical sequence of the Schoenberg's later Harmonielehre (Schoenberg 1911, 1922, trans. 1978; see also R. Hilmar 1984). His annotated copies of Schoenberg's scores include one for Webern's two-piano arrangement of the Five Pieces for Orchestra, op.16 (A-Wn F 21 Berg 155) that would warrant more extensive study than our use of it here in conjunction with the Präludium (Chapter 4) can allow.

More generally, Schoenberg's ways of teaching music and Berg's ways of thinking about harmony, counterpoint, and form manifest themselves with distinction in each of the Opus 6 pieces. Indeed, though such a pithy way of expressing it may at this point appear superficial, my analyses will demonstrate: that the Präludium is about harmony, that Reigen despite its lush harmonies is about form, and that the Marsch despite its formidable features of design is about multiple counterpoint.

Berg's Correspondence. Also central to Berg documentary research is the composer's voluminous correspondence. Berg's letters to his wife have been mentioned above and they are quite informative concerning Opus 6. But the three-way Schoenberg-Berg-Webern correspondence represents even larger game: it is probably the most extensive legacy of music-related letter-exchanges known. In general, the originals of the correspondence to Schoenberg are in the Library of Congress in Washington (US-Wc), the originals to Berg in A-Wn, and the originals to Webern in A-Wst. (Other letters to Webern are in the Moldenhauer Archives in the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Munich (D-Mbs).) The Schoenberg-Berg-Webern
correspondence is a fundamental source for determining the chronology of, and for describing the biographical circumstances surrounding, the composition of Opus 6. Only fragments of the relevant material were published when I first contemplated this project (1983).³

Therefore, in the early stages of this aspect of my work, I took orientation from an index (to 1972) of Berg’s published correspondence (Smith and DeVoto 1975). In the intermediate stages, I was greatly assisted by a partial typescript transcription (at A-Wst in 1987) of the three-way Schoenberg-Berg-Webern correspondence. And, in the final stages, the appearance in English translation of The Berg-Schoenberg Correspondence: Selected Letters, edited by Julianne Brand, Christopher Hailey and Donald Harris (Berg 1987) proved of immense value in decoding several thorny passages and in standardizing my translations of at least the Berg-Schoenberg letters. Berg’s correspondence with the first performers of Opus 6 (after Webern, Johannes Schüler, and Hermann Scherchen) also proved useful, as did the exchanges with his student team of copyists and editorial supervisors (for Opus 6: Gottfried Kassowitz, F.H. Klein, Otto Jokl, and Julius Schloss; and—though with no relevant early correspondence in this case—the later supervisor of the 1954 edition, Hans Erich Apostel).

Collections of scholarly essays. The first collection of essays on Berg, reminiscences really, was the special commemorative issue of the Viennese journal for new music which he had helped found: 23. Eine Musikzeitschrift 24/25 (1 February 1936), “Sonderheft. Alban Berg zum Gedenken.” In more recent years, several collections or ongoing series of Berg studies have appeared that were germane to this project. The International Alban Berg Society Newsletter, though the journal is currently somewhat dormant, was valuable for several documentary studies (including Semler 1968, Smith and DeVoto 1975, Green 1977, and Perle 1977, the latter two concerning the now
famous "secret programme" of the Lyric Suite). Two issues in the Musik-Konzepte series collect papers on Berg's chamber music (Metzger and Riehn 1978 and 1979). A volume of essays was also published in conjunction with the 1980 Berg Conference in Vienna (R. Klein 1981; as Alban Berg Studien, volume 2). Another, somewhat tardy, volume stemmed from the 1985 Chicago Conference (Morgan and Gable 1991). And a third collection is The Berg Companion (Jarman 1989). Each of the last three volumes has at least one item of direct value for Opus 6; as these are mostly analytical in content, they are dealt with near the end of our next section.

Analytical Approaches to Berg's Music

The principal analytical survey of Berg's music is Douglas Jarman's The Music of Alban Berg (Jarman 1979). Though Jarman's book suffers somewhat from its parametric organization (pitch, twelve-tone, rhythm, form) and its theoretical informality (with respect to pitch-class sets and twelve-tone operations), the breadth of his inquiry and the precision and appropriateness of his selections continues to impress. (We will return to Jarman's comments on Opus 6, below.) There are advantages and disadvantages to Jarman's informalism (in British musicology, the alternative being considered generally impolite!), a situation that may be inverted in Dave Headlam's forthcoming monograph on Berg. Headlam comes to Berg from the permutational extreme of twelve-tone theory (see his work on the Lulu-Symphony, and Der Wein). What Headlam's analytical apparatus will bring forth from Berg's earlier works remains to be seen.

Most of Berg's music has been addressed by George Perle in a series of articles and monographs extending over a period more than thirty years. Perle's work is a unique blend of theoretical and musicological, analytical and compositional contributions. As a pioneer in the post-war efforts of
composers to inventory the musical resources of the twelve-tone system, Perle (1954) was the first to establish the distinction between the normal and inverted forms of pitch-class sets. Perle's *Serial Composition and Atonality* (1962; sixth ed., 1991) became the standard readable introduction to the music of Schoenberg, Berg, and Webern. (It contains no references to Berg's Opus 6).

Perle's continuing interest in the theoretical implications and compositional applications of inversional relations led to a codification in his *Twelve-tone Tonality* (Perle 1977a; review Alphonce 1982). Perle sought precedents in the music of Berg (and others) and found one particularly remarkable documentary substantiation in "Berg's master array of the interval cycles" (Perle 1977b). A letter from Berg to Schoenberg (July 27, 1920) encloses "a theoretical trifle" that shows simultaneous melodic progression from a single pitch (C2) by all twelve intervals (Berg includes the octave, rather than the unison) and catalogues the vertical sonorities which result. In less rigorous forms, such combinations of progressions by interval-cycle segments constitute a general feature of Berg's music and we find examples in Opus 6 as well.

Perle's musicological work on Berg includes the discovery of a document with much greater public impact than the "theoretical trifle": namely, the annotated score to the *Lyric Suite* with its "secret programme" (Perle 1977c, also Green 1977). Since this disclosure, closer examination of the circumstances and musical documents relating to Berg's other instrumental works has suggested that programmatic elements also inform the Chamber Concerto (Dalen 1989) and the Violin Concerto (Jarman 1982, and 1989). The present study shows that, in this regard too, Opus 6 was a pivotal moment for Berg: his Three Pieces for Orchestra initiated this programmatic process with the *Marsch eines Asthmaticers* and extended it with *Reigen*, which probably derives its formal design and programmatic
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observations on the Opus 2 songs (Kett 1989), Jody Rockmaker's examination of the revised drafts of the Opus 3 quartet (Rockmaker 1987), and, particularly, Mark DeVoto's work-in-progress transcribing the sketches for the Opus 4 Altenberglieder (DeVoto 1989, and personal communication). Most of this work remains unpublished. I have transcribed the only sketches that I am aware exist for the Opus 5 Clarinet Pieces in conjunction with my transcriptions for Opus 6.

Sketch studies of Berg's later works have been more widely disseminated. These have had some general procedural influence on my work and they shed much light on Berg's general sketching and drafting procedures, though there can of course be no question of chronological interaction with Opus 6. These studies include: David Congdon (1980) and Brenda Dalen (1989) on the Chamber Concerto; Douglass Green (1977) on the Lyric Suite; Constantin Floros (1980) on the Violin Concerto; and, for Lulu, Friedrich Cerha (1979 and 1989), George Perle 1985, and the three published items of Patricia Hall (1985, 1989, and 1991).

Continuing now on the analytical fork, the following additional items are singled out for their influence on my work: Craig Ayrey (1982), supplemented by Douglas Jarman (1987), on Opus 2, no.2; Joel Phillips (1988) on Opus 3; Mark DeVoto (1966 and 1967) on Opus 4; and Christopher Lewis (1981) on Opus 5, no.3. Two studies by Janet Schmalfeldt have more direct bearing on my own work, since they share its analytical methodologies.

Schmalfeldt's Berg's Wozzeck: Harmonic Language and Dramatic Design (1983; a reworking of her 1981 dissertation) is the only full-length study of the opera to employ the theoretical apparatus of pitch-class set theory. Her introductory chapter (1983, pp. 1–28) is a classic presentation of the method's precepts for non-specialists. In the rest of the work, Schmalfeldt convincingly demonstrates the role of particular pitch-class sets and set-
classes in the characterizations of Wozzeck (pp.76–121) and Marie (pp.122–220). Incidentally, she also comments on the “hallucination motive” (Act I, scene 2, mm.274–278) and its version in the *Marsch* (mm.79–83; see Schmalfeldt’s Ex.54, p.151 and p.262, note 6).

Elsewhere, Schmalfeldt has combined set-class identification with the use of voice-leading graphs in an analysis of the exposition of Berg’s Piano Sonata (Schmalfeldt 1991). She shows the underlying tonal basis of Berg’s initial phrase (an incomplete harmonic progression, ii–V–i). Her voice-leading graph for mm.4–12 suggests the projection of an augmented triad; she relates the passage both to the traditional tonal omnibus progression and to the context provided by Berg’s use of alternating whole-tone subsets and recurrent 4–19 [0148] tetrachords as referents in the piece. With due caution, we shall disclose similar procedures in Opus 6.

Schmalfeldt also identifies in her analysis some of the principles of thematic construction that Schoenberg employed in his teaching that, as an analytical tool, were codified by his student Erwin Ratz. In this regard, she acknowledges the work of her former colleague (now mine), William Caplin, who in a work-in-progress has developed a theory of formal function for classical-period music that completely refines and extends Schoenberg and Ratz. Though my analyses of Berg’s processes of thematic exposition in Opus 6 were initially based on the documentary evidence and on his analytical approach to Schoenberg’s early works, my final study owes a number of its refinements in this area to more recent familiarity with Caplin’s work.
Analytical Studies of Opus 6

Though the specifics of my indebtedness to the following authors is acknowledged at the appropriate places below, a brief survey of the analytical studies of Opus 6 seems in order. The studies which refer to all three Opus 6 pieces are: Reich 1937, 52–64 (cf. Adorno 1968); Redlich 1957a, 87–101 (trans. 1957b, 64–73); Reich 1963, 106–107 (trans. 1965); Archibald 1965 and 1989; Adorno 1968, 81–91 (trans. 1991, 72–84); Jarman 1979, principally 37–46; DeVoto 1980, 97–106; and Perle 1980, 11–19. [The late Derrick Puffett's fine Opus 6 essay for *The Cambridge Companion to Berg*, 1997, as well as Headlam's Berg monograph were not available before my own study was completed.] The principal articles on individual pieces are: for the *Präludium*, Jameux 1975, Micznik 1986, and Taylor 1989; for *Reigen*, Archibald 1968, and Falck 1985; and for the *Marsch*, DeVoto 1984.

The earlier general studies are of limited analytic value. Redlich 1957a, 87–101 (trans. 1957b, 64–73) traces the gestural roots of Berg's Hauptrhythmus and thematic profiles to Mahler's Symphonies (particularly the Third, Fifth, Sixth, and Ninth); though his citations (Beispiele 119–123 and 133) are well chosen, the treatment of Opus 6 is generally superficial. The analytical portions of Reich 1937 were culled from notes provided by various sources, the better portions from Berg himself, Ernst Krenek and Theodor Adorno. Adorno's contribution on Opus 6 appears in his own later monograph (Adorno 1968, 81–91; trans. 1991, 72–84). As we stated earlier, Adorno's work, though analytically informal, has moments of metaphorical brilliance.

Reich 1963, however, borrows from Fritz Uhlenbruch, editor of the program booklet for Johannes Schüler's 1930 Oldenburg performance of Opus 6. Though the note is supposedly taken from Berg's "quickly martialed analytical remarks" in a letter to Schüler (02–04–1930), it is hard to imagine a more confusing concatenation of information than what Reich presents in
two paragraphs: four-movement symphonic form in three movements, exceptionally clear and confident architecture, binarity and symmetry, scherzo and slow movement (the supposed sequence in Reigen), march-like group and march proper (from m.53) and a development which is the coda (beginning at m.130). The whole note breeds more obfuscation than enlightenment.

On the other hand, Bruce Archibald has long been a champion of analytical enlightenment concerning Opus 6. His dissertation (1965, unpublished) examines Berg's early harmony in general and he was the first to point out the underlying chordal basis of the Präludium (Archibald 1965, 90). He also identifies the 'Hauptrhythmus' figure of the Präludium and its recurrence in the other pieces (1965, 93n4). Archibald's discussion of the interaction of complex chords with the principles of sonata form in Reigen (1965, 97–100; also 1989, Figure 2, p.117) is vastly expanded in his later article on its harmony (Archibald 1968). There, he also provides a useful summary of the intervallic, motivic, linear, and extended-tonal-functional aspects of Berg's harmonic practice (1968, 76).

Douglas Jarman seizes upon some of the most salient features of the Opus 6 pieces in The Music of Alban Berg (1979, principally pages 37–46). Though I deal with much of this material differently, Jarman correctly identifies the importance of "a number of integrative melodic and harmonic cells" and their generative relation to "certain recurring themes" in the work (p.37). His cell x is a 3–3 (014) trichordal set-class (SC), his cell y a 4–29 (0137) tetrachord, and his cell z a 4–22 (02471) tetrachord. Though Jarman does not employ such SC prime-form labels, my study uses them in order to demonstrate more extensively the important motivic and referential roles these and other pitch-class sets play in Opus 6. Jarman shows the presence of some of these cells in the work's larger thematic constructions (particularly in
his Ex.42) and (without much further comment) juxtaposes several themes with their developmental variants (Exx.43 and 45).

Jarman must also be credited with the remarkable discovery that the 'big tune' at m.66 of the Marsch (also at m.144) is a transposed, 'proto-serial' derivation from the string of pitches inside the texture (in English horn and trombone) near the beginning of the piece. My study discloses the sketch evidence for this derivation. Jarman accurately reports that Berg’s "harmonic structure is determined primarily by motivic considerations. In some cases chords are obtained by stating melodic figurations as vertical formations ... , in others the individual notes of a melodic figuration may determine the pitch at which other melodic figurations are presented (p.45)." My study addresses more directly the relation between horizontal and vertical, motivic and referential collections in the pieces; moreover, it shows that Jarman’s description of Berg’s second way of projecting melodic figurations (admirably illustrated in his Exx.47 and 48) can be placed within the purview of the Schenkerian motivic-transformational techniques known as enlargement ("Vergrößerung") and compression ("Verkleinerung"). Berg’s procedures are in such cases 'isographic' with their tonal analogs.

Jarman also singles out three of the work’s recurrent "themes". Though their recurrence is beyond dispute, these ideas are not considered 'themes' according to the form-functional distinctions made in this study, and we employ different labels for them. Jarman’s "Theme I" designation for the pentachord (SC 5–37 [03458]) that results from the linking of two [014] cells first heard in the fortissimo interjection of the Präludium, mm.11–13 (and most explicitly recalled in mm.161–162 of the Marsch) is, in our analysis of the Präludium, replaced with Berg’s own designation as found in the sketches: “A2”. The same idea is also item five [5 or ‘V’] on DeVoto’s “Table of Themes” for the Marsch (DeVoto 1984) and is so-designated in our
discussion of that piece. Jarman’s “Theme II” and “Theme III” designations are called “delta-1” (its contour inversion “delta-2”) and “alpha-beta”, respectively, in this study, following DeVoto 1980 and 1984.

Mark DeVoto, like Bruce Archibald, has had a long-standing relationship with Opus 6. This has resulted in two published articles just mentioned (DeVoto 1980, and 1984). In addition, a third article, on “creeping chromaticism” (DeVoto 1991; though presented in 1985) is capped with two examples from Opus 6. Though DeVoto’s second article on the Marsch is the most extensive published study for Opus 6 and is frequently referenced in our chapter on that piece, our concern in this introduction is with his earlier and briefer article on all three pieces.

“Alban Bergs Drei Orchesterstücke op.6: Struktur, Thematik und ihr Verhältnis zu Wozzeck” was published in conjunction with the 1980 Berg Conference in Vienna (DeVoto 1980, 97–106). The article surveys many of the features of the three pieces, concentrating for the most part on the underlying chordal progression of the Präludium which finds mm.6–10 expanded as mm.16–23 (p.99–101). My study reconsiders this relationship (first identified by Archibald 1965, 90) in the context of structural voice-leading. It shows that the connection of chords—a procedure acquired by Berg from his harmony instruction with Schoenberg, and plainly evident in the sketches—is here a product of the projection of the intervallic spaces found in a referential sonority, in this case the first chord of the progression (m.6).

In the article, DeVoto labels the themes which are shared between the pieces, “cyclic themes” alpha-beta-gamma and delta. (These first occur at mm.37–39, and m.44 of the Präludium, following its climax in m.36.) Due to the efficacy of these cyclic-thematic labels (and to their presence in DeVoto’s second, more extensive article on the Marsch, as well) I have retained them in this study. DeVoto shows how the principal thematic ideas of the
individual pieces are derived from elements in the cyclic themes (pp.100, 102, 105). He also addresses the thorny issue of Berg’s use of streams of chords for motivic purposes, and identifies several complex manifestations of this practice (pp.103–104). DeVoto’s references to Wozzeck are limited to the acknowledgement of the quoted passage, and to the accurate observation that the opera represents, in many respects, a “simplification” of the thematic transformational processes set loose in Opus 6, an “avoidance” of so much “unnecessary complication” of the surface (p.106, paraphrasing).

This introduction does not deal with the published analytical studies of the individual pieces in any detail; acknowledgements are reserved for the chapters. As guides to their respective pieces, however, DeVoto’s extended article on the Marsch (1984)—particularly the extremely valuable “Table of Themes and Chronology of Events”—and Archibald’s compressed survey of the harmony of Reigen (1966) remain highly useful. Michael Taylor’s (1989) study of “musical progression” in the Präludium, though less comprehensive in intent, is particularly welcome for its emphasis on Berg’s controlled use of silence and his timbral transitions in the opening and closing of that piece—important parameters which the present study, with its emphasis on matters of formal design, structural voice-leading, and set-class content, is regularly obliged to undervalue. Finally, it should be noted that I have presented conference papers on the individual pieces on three occasions (see the bibliographical entries for McLean: 1987 on the Präludium, 1996 on Reigen, and 1988 on the Marsch). This brings us to a discussion of the approach of this study.
Approach of this study

Documentary Approach. The preliminary work for this study examined several hundred pages of Berg's sketches for the *Altenberglieder*, Clarinet Pieces, Opus 6, and the earliest sketches for *Wozzeck*. All of these sketches are inventoried in Chapter 3. Approximately 60 sketchbook pages were assignable to Opus 6 and these were transcribed to the extent possible. The most interesting of these sketches are presented in the chapters that follow. My transcriptions of Berg's sketches are handwritten, since their general messiness and the numerous unconventionalities in the disposition of notes (both verbal and musical) leaves even the best of today's computer-based notational programs inadequate to the task.

By contrast, my analytical examples consist of annotations to a reduced score, and these (with a couple of exceptions) have been set by computer. The examples are "reductions" both in the sense that they reduce the full score to fewer staves and that they sometimes omit materials present in the complete orchestral texture; or that, in a few cases, they represent deeper or more general structural levels. Omissions are for the most part explained, but the sheer density of the work—even in reduction—dictated that a great deal of information concerning instrumentation, articulation, dynamics, tempo changes, etc. had to be left out of the examples to avoid cluttering them to the point of illegibility. Though it is expected that the reader will be able to follow the discourse assisted by my transcriptions and analytical examples without constant recourse to the published score, it is anticipated that most readers will still want to keep the orchestral version handy.

Naturally, some compromise had to be reached between making 'diplomatic facsimiles' of Berg's original sketches—with all their overtracings, deletions, scribblings-out, illegible textual scrawls, etc.—and effecting 'transcriptions' that were so antiseptic and editorially selective that they
would end up seriously misrepresenting the originals. Accordingly, the transcribed examples are not always as clear as one might like, but, it is hoped, adequate for the purpose of illustrating the discussion and doing justice to the contents of the originals. One general problem: Berg's sketchbooks for Opus 6 are in small oblong format (complete description is found in Chapter 3). In order to minimize the reader's need to rotate the page, my transcriptions have been reworked into upright format. This affects page-size crossings-out and a few textual entries in a particularly negative fashion by rescaling them oddly, but most of the pages' contents are not adversely affected. Moreover, in cases where a facsimile of a sketch page is included, the facsimile had to be reproduced in its original oblong format and rotated 90° left; it is hoped that the reader will find this slight inconvenience preferable to the complete distortion of the original which would result from resizing its image.

**Analytical approach.** As was briefly stated at the beginning of our discussion of Procedure, the analytical component of this study involves the coordination—if not always the happy synthesis—of three complementary analytical tools: structural voice-leading, pitch-class set theory, and the analysis of formal function. We will discuss each in turn.

**Structural voice-leading analysis.** Any consideration of structural voice-leading analysis has its point of departure in the theory of Heinrich Schenker (1868–1935), and in the analytical applications of that theory to triadic tonal music as undertaken by Schenker and his followers. As Milton Babbitt has succinctly observed, the body of Schenker's work "reveals the constant growth, from the most tentative adumbrations, of the awareness of the basic continuity of the musical organism in terms of the correlation and interaction of the linear realization of a triadic span with the specific triadic
harmonic articulations (1952, 260).” A reformulation appropriate to Opus 6 of Babbitt’s description of the “musical organism” will be contemplated later on.

Schenkerian analysis is a challenging enough undertaking in conventional tonal music; its application to post-tonal works is fraught with difficulties and has been a justifiably contentious matter within the music theory discipline. Any attempt to formulate a critical summary of the history of the problem, let alone to come up with a properly detailed and viable set of recommendations for a working solution, would now require a monograph (or several) of extensive scope. For present purposes, I will briefly summarize certain stages in the history of the problem in order to arrive at a description and explanation of the procedures found in this study.

A survey of the early history would include: Schenker 1926, Katz 1945, Salzer 1952, and the Travis-Oster controversy 1959–1960. Soon thereafter, pitch-class set analysis (codified in Forte 1973) became the established orthodoxy for atonal music, and Schenkerian analysis (and analysts) retreated to the tonal repertoire—and, for the most part, to the tonal repertoire from Bach to Brahms. With the burgeoning of graduate studies in music theory in the 1960s and 1970s, students trained in both analytical paradigms began to contemplate a theoretical synthesis or at least a practical analytical amalgamation. A good survey of the general state at this time is James Baker’s contribution to Aspects of Schenkerian Theory (ed. Beach, 1983, pp.153–186). To put it bluntly, a dichotomy had set in: one used Schenker for the tonal bits, pitch-class (pc-)set theory for the shrapnel.\(^9\) And, apart from a few appeals to inclusion relations or prosaic auxiliary hypotheses, never did the twain meet.

This is not to say that scholars gave up on the matter. Indeed, a survey of the monographs in the important Yale series, “Composers of the twentieth century,” reveals that most of these studies are concerned with developing
models of structural voice-leading appropriate to the works of their particular composer. It is just that each work carefully develops a disclaimer, in order to keep the paradigms pure.

By ‘structural voice-leading’ I mean analysis that is concerned with the ways in which (the routines by which) the various voices of a polyphonic texture interact and move. The ‘structural’ aspects of this analysis involve assessment not only of the superficial voice-leading routines of a work but also of its deeper-level organization: its establishment of hierarchical levels, its motivic correspondences between those levels, and the large-scale and local means by which its vertical (and sometimes structurally referential) sonorities and its lines (in the form of motives as well as registrally discrete streams of pitches) interrelate.

The difficulties associated with the direct transplant of Schenkerian techniques to atonal works have been neatly summarized by Edward Laufer, in a digression—a curious mixture of lament, suggestion, and rather precise technical commentary—to his review (1981, p.161) of the Oster translation (1979) of Schenker’s Der freie Satz (1935; rev.ed. 1954). As Laufer states:

The technical problems of twentieth-century applications [of Schenker’s concepts] are obvious. There is no triad to be prolonged: thus, some contextually derived associative sonority must take its place. The concepts of consonance and dissonance, as technically defined, therefore cannot exist, nor can, strictly speaking, the notion of passing and neighbour notes where these were dissonant events. Their attendant constraints, which provided motion and delays, must be compensated for by other kinds of embellishing and traversing motions. There is probably no generalized fundamental line: it could not now be diatonic. But perhaps it might move by smallest intervals. Principal tones must be designated by other kinds of emphasis, but on what consistent, non-subjective basis? By and by one asks what is left, as all the specific techniques Schenker describes must all go by the board or be diluted into an indistinct blur. Only the general attitude? But if there is no technically consistent, non-speculative basis, then anything goes, and likewise nothing.
The 'downer' with which the preceding quotation ends does not entirely obviate the value of some of its technical comments and hints: "contextually derived associative sonority," "consonance and dissonance, as technically defined," "embellishing and traversing motions," "no generalized fundamental line," motion "by smallest intervals," "principal tones designated by other kinds of emphasis," "technically consistent, non-speculative basis," and "specific techniques Schenker describes." We shall deal with these ideas over the next few paragraphs.

Laufer's "contextually derived associative sonority" is what I will call a 'referential sonority' (the term probably originated with Babbitt and is also used by Laufer and many others), or, more locally, the 'prevailing structural sonority'. In the case of Opus 6, Berg imbues particular chords with referential status by placing them at significant formal junctures and by returning to them and manipulating them in specifiable ways. More locally, Berg controls the sonority of 'associative harmonies' in the transit between iterations of a referential sonority.

For scholars trained in Schenkerian analysis and pitch-class set theory, there is naturally considerable interest in determining to what extent such recurrence of a referential sonority is analogous to tonal prolongation. A pivotal contribution to this discussion is Joseph Straus's "The Problem of Prolongation in Post-Tonal Music" (1987). His description of four conditions necessary for prolongation—consonance/dissonance-determined structural weight, scale-degree hierarchy, defined embellishment types, and harmony/voice leading distinction (i.e., functional distinction between vertical and horizontal dimensions)—partially parallels Laufer's litany, and provides a more thorough discussion of widely-shared concerns. Straus's arguments are nevertheless somewhat circular and incomplete, since prolongation is defined exclusively in terms of its manifestation in tonal
music. A revised dichotomy results: "prolongation" of a tonal sonority is
distinguished from motivic "association" between reiterations and
projections of sonorities in post-tonal contexts.

Of course, in tonal music, it is not merely the triad as a sonority that
is prolonged, it is the function of that triad that is prolonged in the context of its
constellation of related triadic scale-steps. (The whole point to prolongation
is that it allows us to imagine the function of a sonority continues, even
though the sonority itself may no longer be physically present; in a reductive
graph, the sonority stands as the representative token of its function at a
particular level.) At various levels of a tonal work, a prevailing structural
sonority is contextually identified. Locally this sonority may be dissonant or
consonant, though routines of voice-leading (of dissonance treatment) dictate
that dissonant sonorities will be dependent on consonant sonorities at deeper
structural levels. At more middleground levels the prevailing structural
sonority is regularly a prolongation of one of the tonic's related scale-steps—
often one of the "specific triadic harmonic articulations" described by Babbitt.

Atonal music undeniably lacks this constellation of related scale-steps
with their defined locus and concomittant potential for functional relation
and hierarchical organization. However, even in atonal circumstances a
subordinate formal area may be represented by a prevailing structural
sonority that is—like its tonal scale-step counterparts—transpositionally
derived from an earlier version; or that sonority may be a redisposition or
some other transformation of its earlier version.

As both Laufer and Straus have noted, "consonance and dissonance, as
technically defined" determinants of local structural weight and large-scale
voice-leading action in tonal music, do not have that function in post-tonal
works. (Though acoustical considerations often play a role in the selection
and disposition of referential sonorities and in our perception of their
relative structural weights.) If, however, we consider that the rules of dissonance treatment in tonal music—general affinities to acoustical considerations aside—concern the identification of tones as 'members', or 'non-members', of a preferred local or large-scale referential sonority (interval, chord, scale-step); and if we see that the "embellishing and traversing motions" that account for voice-leading about and within a prevailing structural sonority also hinge on the identification of its members, and the description of the means by which its non-members relate to, and reinforce the status of, members; then we can see that, given a clear enough context, we can define prevailing structural or referential sonorities in many atonal circumstances and can describe the embellishing and traversing motions about or within such sonorities in terms of their membership status. Indeed, much atonal music consists of the juxtaposition of motives in contrapuntal strata that are no longer coordinated according to the restraints of tonal consonance-dissonance treatment, but which may still interact on the basis of the pitch and intervallic correspondences between members (and through analytical selection, non-members) on the different strata.

On another theoretical matter, as Laufer notes, there can certainly be "no generalized fundamental line" for atonal music. But there can be motion between members of a referential sonority where that sonority is reiterated or temporally projected. Laufer hints that such motion might be "by smallest intervals"; this acknowledges the continuing value of 'stepwise' motion in atonal contexts, but does not address the need to determine, in a given case, why such motion takes place by 'tone' or by 'semitone' (or by some combination of these and other intervals) in a situation where no "diatonic" norm can be established, and where, therefore, linear motions produce other kinds of collections which must be contextually assessed.
The importance of context in atonal works cannot be overemphasized, but we perhaps often overlook that a good deal of contextuality is involved in our perception and analysis of tonal music as well. In particular, the great influx of contextuality in later nineteenth century music has been one of the obstacles to the expeditious analysis of that repertoire using Schenkerian tools. This problem has been addressed by Allen Forte in a series of articles from the 1980s that supplement tonal reductive graphs with extensive annotations of relatively autonomous motivic workings, the latter sometimes labeled as pitch-class sets. In these articles, Forte, long an advocate for the exclusive restriction of Schenkerian and pitch-class set-theoretical methods to their respective domains, enacts a methodological overlap through analyses of works by Brahms (1983), Mahler (1984), Liszt (1987), Stravinsky, Wagner, and Scriabin (1988). In the last of these studies, Forte posits “guidelines for linear analysis” that concern the need to relate large-scale lines to motivic structure, to demonstrate how non-tonal referential collections are expressed without violation of the salient surface segmentation, and to account for the onset and closure linear configurations alone or in combination (1988, 346).

This process to a large extent culminates in the second of Forte’s two studies of excerpts from Berg’s Wozzeck (Forte 1985 and 1991) in which he undertakes parallel “linear” and “tonal” analyses of the opera’s Symphonic Epilogue. An overall goal of Forte’s analysis of the Epilogue is the concrete demonstration of Schoenberg’s view that “a piece remains comprehensible even when the relation to the tonic is not regarded as fundamental” (quoted from the 1922 edition of the Harmonielehre [p.157] as part of Forte’s epigraph, 1991, 151). And, in a conclusion with which our structural voice-leading approach to Opus 6 would concur, Forte states that “the atonal structure [of
the Epilogue] exhibits qualities that render it far superior to a conventional
and—I believe—essentially arbitrary tonal framework (199)."

Like most of Berg’s music, Opus 6 features numerous ‘tonalisms’:
allusions—both wistful and dramatic—to familiar conventions of tonal
sonority and closure. But these allusions generally prove illusory as
determinants of long-range structural function. Overall, the desire to find
some “technically consistent, non-speculative basis” for the identification of
the “principal tones” (in the simple sense of the main structural notes) in any
atonal passage—even for Berg’s Epilogue, which was, after all, designated an
“Invention on a Tonality”—seems unlikely to be fulfilled by adopting or
conveniently modifying those stabilizing factors of consonance and
dissonance that are the handmaidens of tonal prolongation.

An alternative approach is taken by Fred Lerdahl in his “Atonal
prolongational structure” (1989). Building on the implications of A
Generative Theory of Tonal Music (Lerdahl and Jackendoff, 1983), Lerdahl
decides “to regard contextual salience in atonal music as analogous to stability
in tonal music.” He goes on to describe various “salience conditions” that
characterize atonal surfaces and assigns weights to their “relative strength of
application” in order to hierarchize events within “time-span reductions”.
He then posits “prolongation” in terms of the exact (“strong”) or modified
(“weak”) repetition of an event or its change (“progression”) and begins to
develop “preference rules” for establishing the “prolongational importance”
of events and their “prolongational connection” in tree form, where, in
general, right-branching is departure and left-branching is return (1989, 73–
75). Lerdahl applies his method to three short Schoenberg excerpts with
interesting results. Though the prospect of applying Lerdahl’s approach
systematically to something as daunting as Berg’s Opus 6 might be intriguing,
I found that I could not, for example, determine the “salience conditions” for
the opening of the Präludium with adequate precision to feel I was properly testing the tool. Nonetheless, my analysis of the recurrent sonorities in that piece could probably be well rendered in a tree structure along the lines shown in Lerdahl's 'atonal prolongational model'.

Another issue that Laufer wonders about concerns the adaptability of "the specific techniques Schenker describes" to post-tonal circumstances. Though a proper technical demonstration would require lengthy discourse and the examination of numerous repertoire examples, it can be said here that many Schenkerian voice-leading techniques do seem to have their analogues in Opus 6: techniques such as: arpeggiation, neighbouring (or adjacency and embellishing) motions, passing (or traversing) motions (including the skipped passing tone), various types of registral manipulation including unfolding, reaching over, cover tones, etc.

More centrally, the approach of this study posits contextually-defined prevailing structural, or referential, sonorities for numerous passages (and for most of the Präludium) and shows how the structural voice-leading realizes these sonorities in two main fashions: (1) by projecting the sonorities horizontally, sometimes at various structural levels; and (2) by 'composing between the tones' (the expression adapted from Laufer 1986) of a reiterated referential sonority. Thus, in a reformulation of the Babbitt quotation above, we find in the Präludium 'the linear realization of the component spans of a non-triadic referential sonority with specific non-triadic associative-harmonic articulations'.

The present study also acknowledges the structural role played by certain general voice-leading procedures that appear as localized phenomena. These include: directed motion to a referential pitch via 'wedging' (cf. Lewin 1987, 124–132); the related and more specifically Bergian routines of progression by inversionally-related dyads (cf. Perle 1977a; and 1977b, 16–17)
and by interval-cycle segments (cf. Perle 1977a; and 1977b, 76–79); and “a principle of generalized contrapuntal behaviour” in which “one or more parts move by stepwise motion” that Mark DeVoto has called “creeping” (an extended treatment is DeVoto 1991, in Gable and Morgan, pp.57–78).

Finally, in its structural voice-leading approach to Opus 6, this study discovers instances of motivic transformational techniques traditionally associated with Schenkerian analysis of tonal works. These techniques, collectively considered a fascinating but ancillary aspect of Schenkerian tonal theory (cf. Burkhart 1978, 1983, and Rothgeb 1983), are more significant and stylistically ubiquitous than has generally been acknowledged (cf. Alegant and McLean 1995). The techniques include: ‘enlargement [Vergrößerung]’, the representation of a motive in expanded form; ‘compression [Verkleinerung]’, the representation of a motive in compact form; ‘structural framing’, the reference back to the opening idea of a formal unit at its conclusion; and ‘linkage technique [Kniipftechnik]’, where “a new phrase takes as its initial idea the end of the immediately preceding one and then continues independently” (Jonas [1934] 1982, 7–8). ‘Structural framing’ is an important clarifying feature in Berg’s formal designs, and ‘linkage technique’—recall Adorno’s description of the composer as the “master of the smallest link [der Meister des kleinstens Übergangs]”—is something of a methodological obsession for Berg in his thematic constructions (evidently so in Reigen).

**Pitch-class set theory.** As was noted above, Janet Schmalfeldt’s study of *Wozzeck* contains an excellent brief introduction to the basic precepts of pitch-class set theory for non-specialists (1983, 1–28). All studies of atonal (and twelve-tone) music are indebted to the well-known writings of Babbitt, Forte, and Perle. For atonal theory in particular, Forte 1973, Rahn 1980, Straus 1990, Morris 1987 and Morris 1991 explore fundamental principles and
provide the requisite tables of the standard set-classes as well as other useful general information.

When making observations about the pitch content of atonal music, it is important to be conscious of the relative degree of abstraction involved in a particular instance. Observations which concern identical pitches are obviously more concrete than those which concern pitch-class identity, where the recognition of octave equivalence and registral manipulation come into play in musical circumstances that are often quite complex. Recognition of pitch-class sets, where these are clearly audible as referential chordal or motivic entities, is a less problematic undertaking when such pc sets match the segmentation of the musical surface (cf. Hasty 1981) or can be easily understood as the product of its partitioning.

Though Berg clearly lacked absolute pitch, he clearly valued actual (registra\-lly-precise) pitches as structural referents. In many cases, it is an actual pitch or collection of pitches that is picked up, structurally retained, or returns at a significant formal juncture. At the same time, it is clear that Berg exploited octave equivalence in pitch relations through the transposition of motives and the registral rearrangement of referential collections. From his motivic manipulations in score and sketch, it is also clear that Berg recognized pitch-class sets as objects that could be imbued with formal functions, and that he acknowledged and employed the concept of the transpositional and inversional (Tn/TnI) equivalence of pitch-class sets. In some cases, it will be important for us to belabour the way that one pc set relates to another: to emphasize the pitch or pitch-class invariance, to detail the actual or potential inclusion relations that obtain between them. In most cases, however, my analytical examples simply identify pc sets by supplying their Forte numbers and prime forms; the examples thereby assert motivic correspondence between pc sets by giving them the same set-class label.
Apart from such assertions of pitch, pitch-class, and set-class identity, this study is less occupied with many of the other common concerns of set theory, such as $Z$-related pairs, complementation, inclusion relations, similarity relations, and contour theory. We will have occasion to acknowledge the presence (perhaps largely intuitive) of certain $Z$-related pentachords in Opus 6. The $Z$-relation obtains between pc sets of the same cardinality that are not representations of the same set-class (i.e., do not have the same prime form) but which do have the same interval content (i.e., have the same interval-class vector) and can, therefore, be disposed in such a manner that they have quite similar sound character. Complementation—the fact that, given the twelve-pc aggregate of pc-space, a collection of four pcs (for example) automatically defines its eight-pc complement—plays an occasional role in Opus 6, but our use is largely restricted to more concrete (or literal) instances. Assertions about abstract (set-class) inclusion (including Forte's $K$ and $Kh$ relations) are felt problematic by this author, and attempts to construct a reasonable lattice of set-class inclusions for other than small-scale situations in Opus 6 have not proven helpful. On the other hand, it has often been instructive to consider local inclusion relations against the backdrop of abstract possibility. This allows one to assess how common (and, therefore, how rich and/or trivial) a given inclusion relation may be; to this end, the "Set-Class Inclusion Table" given in Morris 1991 (Appendix 2, pp.112-155) proves extremely valuable.

Given the widespread perception of Berg's "looseness" in the handling of surface pitch-class set relations one might suppose that assertions of pitch, pitch-class, and set-class identity could be profitably supplemented by considerations of similarity and contour. The author has, in fact, however, found these approaches of limited value for Opus 6. For one thing, I remain unconvinced that the theoretical overhead that encumbers most discussions
and measurements of similarity relations between pitch-class sets contributes much to the recognition (sometimes the rejection) of likeness that most musicians quickly ascertain without such apparatus. Analysis of contour, on the other hand, might seem a more reasonable undertaking, particularly given the corroborating evidence of Berg's sketches, which (for the Marsch) consist of page after page of rhythmic contours that are only minimally accurate with respect to pitch content. I draw upon some basic concepts of contour theory (as summarized in Morris 1993) in examining thematic ideas in both score and sketch.¹⁴

The following conventions of nomenclature are employed in this study with respect to pitch, pitch-class, and set-class. Pitches are designated alphabetically; register is indicated as follows: middle C is C₄; octave labels change at C, the octave above middle C being C₅, the octave below C₃, etc. (The following examples use the main motive [basic idea] and referential sonority [chord ‘A’] of the Präludium, by way of illustration.) Strings of pitches are shown as follows: E₄-G₄-Ab₄-G₄; the pitches are listed in the order that they occur in real time. When the ordered string is a verticality, the pitches are listed from bass to treble: e.g., G₂-F₃-Bb₃-Eb₄-Ab₄.

Pitch classes (pcs) are designated by integers modulo 12: all C's (or enharmonic equivalents) are pc 0, C#'s/Db's are pc 1, D's are pc 2, ..., A#'s/Bb's are pc A, B's/Cb's are pc B. An ordered string of pcs is listed in bent brackets: e.g., <4787>. When the ordered string is a verticality, the pcs are listed from bass to treble as disposed in the pitches of the score: e.g., <75A38>. Occasionally it is useful to refer to an unordered collection of pcs; in such cases the pcs are enclosed in braces: e.g., {478}. (As a matter of reading convenience, the pcs in such 'unordered' collections are often listed in numerical order.)
Set-classes (SCs) are designated in two ways, since the theoretical community has two prevalent labeling habits: "Forte numbers" (after Forte 1973) and "prime forms" (using the Rahn/Morris algorithm). In cases where I wish to refer to a set-class and to its representative pc-set as an ordered string that occurs in the music, a certain amount of unavoidably cryptic-looking overhead is involved. For example, the referential chord listed in the preceding paragraph may appear as follows: SC 5–23 [02357] as <75A38>; i.e., set-class with Forte number 5–23 and prime form [02357] which occurs in the music as pc string <75A38> (actually G2–F3–Bb3–Eb3–Ab3 in the score). (For reasons of space on the examples, trichordal sets are often simply identified by their prime form without the square brackets: e.g., 014 rather than [014].)

Throughout this study, the commentary refers to chordal and melodic entities as ordered strings of pcs. This takes less space than the designation of actual pitches, and one quickly develops the knack of translating strings of integers into potential alphabetical-labels and into the musical notes which appear in the analytical example at hand (and in the score). In general, commentary on the analytical examples is restricted to important features of the topic at hand. By way of service, however, the examples sometimes provide considerable additional information concerning the surface formal design, local voice-leading considerations, and the identification of selected pitch-class sets. Occasionally, therefore, the examples can give the appearance that the analyst is either too catholic in his application of the method (though perhaps still too selective for many tastes) or that he is entirely gullible. It is the role of the commentary to emphasize the main observations recorded in the examples and to distinguish incidence from more significant incidence.

**Analysis of formal function.** Description of the component parts of formal designs at the movement, section, and phrase levels has a venerable theoretical pedigree, but the analysis of formal function (particularly as
applied to the construction of phrases in the process of composition) was one of Schoenberg's theoretical preoccupations. Its exposition no doubt figured prominently in his teaching even in the early period of Berg's instruction. However, apart from the conceptualization of form which we may infer by proxy from Berg's analyses of Schoenberg's work, Schoenberg's development of his formal theory is dispersed amongst several well-known publications, all of which considerably postdate Opus 6; in particular: *Models for Beginners in Composition* (1948), *Structural Functions of Harmony* (1954, posthumous), and *Fundamentals of Musical Composition* (1967, posthumous). As noted above in our discussion of some of Janet Schmalfeldt's work, Schoenberg's formal theory was codified by his student Erwin Ratz, and has recently been vastly extended and refined by William Caplin.

In this study of Opus 6, I have found that many of the most salient features of the musical surface can be effectively explained and modeled by employing some of the form-functional descriptors of Schoenberg-Ratz-Caplin. Some general principles are outlined here. Many of Berg's themes show typical "sentence" structure. Typical sentence structure consists of three formal functions: presentation, continuation, and cadential. The "presentation function" consists of a "basic idea" (b.i.) approximately two measures in length (sometimes contracted or expanded from this norm) which is immediately and recognizably repeated. (In triadic tonal music, such repetition of the basic idea normally involves tonic-dominant statement-response, sequential or arpeggiated shift to some other scale-step, or exact repetition with little or no figurative variation.)

The "continuation function" shows various combinations of fragmentation (shortening the length of the units), acceleration of harmonic rhythm, and increase in surface rhythmic activity. The continuation also often features some form of model-sequence technique, and the liquidation
(Schoenberg's term) of characteristic motives as cadential function takes over. In an appropriate phrase context in triadic tonal music, the "cadential function" typically consists of a harmonic progression which begins with a destabilized variant of tonic harmony (usually $I^6$ or some substitute) and proceeds through intermediate or pre-dominant harmony to (or through) the dominant. Standard cadential types—the half cadence, authentic and deceptive cadences, etc.—are defined depending on what happens next.

Once one is aware of their typical features, the presentation and continuation functions are often easily found in Berg's thematic designs. The cadential function of course—at least as defined in the tonal-harmonic terms outlined above—plays little role in atonal music, including Opus 6. Yet the psychological qualities that attend tonal cadential function are apparent at the ends of Berg's thematic structures: falling contour, slowing tempo, the arrival (or return) of a significant referential sonority, vestigially tonal voice-leading combinations, and so on. Occasional tonalisms aside, then, it is 'caesura' that replaces cadential function in most instances in Opus 6.

The normal alternative to sentence structure is the "period". Periods show the formal functions of "antecedent" and "consequent". Antecedent function consists of a "basic idea" (b.i.) approximately two measures in length which is followed by a two-measure "contrasting idea" (or 'complementary idea'; c.i.) which moves to a cadence (routinely a half cadence). In some discussions of tonal music, the terms antecedent and consequent are used in a cavalier manner for virtually any two-component phrase structure; a more viable frame of reference restricts usage to situations where the consequent phrase clearly recommences with the material of the antecedent but concludes with a relatively stronger cadential progression.15

Since, however, as we have just noted, cadential functions are not conventional in Opus 6, determining true antecedent function can be
problematic. In this study, “antecedent function” is declared in situations where the b.i. is followed by a c.i. (rather than by the sentence-type repetition of the b.i.) and where that c.i. ends with the kind of cadential-like features noted above.

Berg’s idiom shows such antecedent structures, but a consequent does not normally ensue. This is entirely predictable, since such overt repetition goes against Berg’s preference for continuous development, and since the realization of ‘relatively stronger cadential weight’ at the end of the consequent phrase merely doubles the already problematic nature of the role of cadential caesura in the antecedent. Following an antecedent function, then, it is Berg’s habit to develop his material by switching to continuation function. In cases where the c.i. lacks entirely the cadential features of antecedent function, it is preferable (following Caplin) to construe a “compound basic idea” (c.b.i.); that c.b.i. may then be repeated in sentence-like presentation function, or, in more “looseknit” circumstances, may be immediately overtaken by continuation function.

The relatively tightknit or looseknit designs of Berg’s thematic structures, the relative transparency or density of their texture, and the relative clarity of their formal functions as outlined above: these factors contribute greatly to the determination at larger structural levels of such familiar formal functions as introduction and coda, main theme and subordinate theme, transition and retransition, contrasting middle section, etc. We shall return to an assessment of Berg’s control of these familiar formal functions at the thematic and sectional levels when we re-examine the overall formal design of the individual pieces of Opus 6 in the chapters which follow.

Berg’s giftedness in formal construction is widely acknowledged. His reworkings of traditional large-scale formal schemata in his operas and other
works has been well documented. Yet the nature of his reliance on the manipulation of traditional formal functions at the thematic and sectional levels has largely been unappreciated and has not been systematically explored.

It is to Berg's mastery of formal function that Perle alludes in the quotation given near the beginning of this chapter, where he notes that Berg, with Opus 6, "discovered the essential role that traditional forms and traditional stylistic details could play in restoring the possibility of coherent large-scale structure which the dissolution of the classical tonal system had destroyed (Perle 1980, 17)." This is what Adorno speaks of when he says: "In Berg's mature works ultimately every phrase or partial entity not only divulges with complete clarity to cognitive understanding its formal function, but also makes that formal function so emphatic a part of the directly perceived phenomenon that a concluding phrase declares: I am a concluding phrase; and a continuation declares: I am a continuation. (Adorno 1991, 39)." Finally, this form-functional clarity has contributed much to the approachability of Berg's musical style: superficial tonalisms and emulations of folk and popular idioms aside, it is part of what J. Peter Burkholder refers to in his "Berg and the Possibility of Popularity," when he says:

Whether he is working with general musical associations or specific ones, Berg's strategy is the same: just as a deceptive cadence refers to the tonic but avoids it [cf. Marsch, m.155], Berg refers to the musical commonplace but steers clear of it, presenting enough of the familiar idea to allow us to recognize it, consciously or not, and then changing it to make it new. We catch the same rhetorical content, the formal and expressive associations we have with each device Berg calls to mind, but the familiar musical devices themselves are altered. ...

The surface of Berg's music is familiar, while its structure depends upon a rich network of purely musical relationships controlled by
atonal sets and twelve-tone series, guaranteeing inner unity. This combination of the traditional rhetoric of tonal music with the new forms of organization native to atonal music sounds like a recipe for chaos, for the two would appear to have nothing to do with each other. But Berg carefully co-ordinates the two, so that each illuminates the other, and the inner structure is always emphasized and highlighted, never obscured, by the surface rhetoric.

In Opus 6, both “inner structure” and outer design are often “obscured”—indeed buried—by excesses of textural density and ‘looseness’ in pc-set relations. But Berg’s grasp of “surface rhetoric” (formal function), his “rich network of purely musically relationships controlled by atonal sets,” and his use of local and long-range referential sonorities and structural voice-leading procedures are sufficient to ensure a work beautiful in many of its parts and most compelling in its overall effect.

Plan:

The final section of this chapter lays out the plan for the chapters that follow. Since an overview of the musical documents related to Opus 6 would overburden our introduction, that survey has been separated off as the “March through the Documents” of Chapter 3. That overview begins with three charts that give location-description-date information for the Opus 6 documents from the earliest sketches to today’s editions. More detailed descriptions of the physical make-up and musical contents then follow for those items most important to the present study (sketches and Particell, as well as autograph scores). The discussion of the sketches is particularly extensive since it involves the proposed reconstructive amalgamation of two sources now in different locations. Naturally, discussion of the minutiae of such documents requires an understanding of their musical context, and that can only be provided by the treatment of the individual pieces in separate
chapters (4, 5, and 7). Similarly, further description of the documents which pertain to the performance and publication history of Opus 6 is deferred until Chapter 6 (its plan is described below).

The raw "documentary march" of Chapter 3 is preceded by a chapter that tells the story of the composition of Opus 6 in more human terms. As chronological-biographical narrative, Chapter 2 begins at the time of the earliest sketches, with the Schoenberg-Berg relation in 1912, turns to Berg's plans for an orchestral work, and lays out the relation between those plans and the op.4 Altenberglieder and the abandoned Passacaglia-Fragment. The narrative continues with the scandalous partial premiere of op.4 and Berg's renewed plans for an orchestral work, this time discussing the relation of the abandoned Symphonie-Fragment to those plans. I then posit that Berg achieved the breakthrough to Opus 6, in part, by adopting a programmatic posture towards himself and his work, an attitude that would remain with him throughout the rest of his life. The discourse chronicles Berg's progress on the composition and his presentation of the Marsch and the Präludium to Schoenberg in September of 1914. The chapter concludes with Berg's completion of Reigen in 1915 and with his continued concerns about Schoenberg's lack of response to the pieces.

The later performance and publication history of Opus 6 is deferred until the "Interlude" of Chapter 6, which comes between the chapters on Reigen and the Marsch. This placement was chosen for three reasons. First, it provides a necessary "breather" in the analytical discourse for those bold enough to read this study in sequence (though "divers" [cf. Meyer 1991, 241] may prefer to 'check their tanks' and proceed directly to the Marsch). Second, it gives us a context in which to address Berg's supposed approval of performances of the first two pieces alone without the Marsch (a situation that is shown dubious from a documentary perspective). Third, the early
performance history centres on *Reigen* alone. The chapter begins by revisiting the Berg-Schoenberg relationship as we left it at the end of Chapter 2 and shows how it developed after the War. The chapter continues with the documentation of Berg’s arrangements of Opus 6 and with a discussion of his revisions to the full score. The chapter ends with a brief review of the mostly-posthumous processes which led to the current edition.

Following the "March through the Documents" of Chapter 3, we turn to the separate chapters (4, 5, and 7) that are devoted to studies of the individual pieces. In each instance we begin with an overview of the formal design; we then proceed with observations on its subdivisions. The discourse—documentary and analytical—follows the formal design of the piece, and the evidence of the sketches and Particell is worked in as we go. As a result certain sections receive a great deal more attention than others, since the documentary materials for those sections or their analytical complexities (or, occasionally, both) may demand disproportionately lengthy discussion. Each piece also elicits its own analytical and documentary focus.

**Chapter 4** is devoted to the *Präludium* and argues that the piece posits a structurally referential sonority and that much of the voice-leading and motivic activity of the piece can be understood as a "composing between the tones" of that sonority. "Composing between the tones" of a referential sonority (the expression, as was noted above, comes from Laufer 1986) is a phenomenon of structural voice-leading that can be found operative to various extents in many twentieth-century pieces, Berg’s *Präludium* being a particularly rich and revealing example. It is shown that Berg’s model for the referential sonority (a ‘gapped fourth-chord’) and his sources for the compositional procedure can be found in Schoenberg’s teaching and compositions, and that the kernel of Berg’s realization of the process is evident in his sketches.
Chapter 5 is a study of *Reigen*. The chapter begins with a documentary introduction that relates Berg's work to Arthur Schnitzler's play of the same name, examines the biographical links between the two authors, and compares the formal designs of the two works. (The programmatic link to Schnitzler's play was first posited in Falck 1985.) The central portion of the chapter analyzes the formal structure of Berg's piece and characterizes his procedures under the rubrics 'blocks, chains, and cycles.' The end of the chapter revisits the programmatic aspects of the design in a documentary and analytical coda that combines the design of Schnitzler's scenes (supplemented by the numerology of Wilhelm Fließ) with the structure of Berg's piece.

(Chapter 6, for the reasons stated above, is an "Interlude" on the performance and publication history of Opus 6.)

Chapter 7 approaches the *Marsch*. The first task in this piece is to orient ourselves to its broad formal design; this action is immensely aided by Mark DeVoto's tabulation of thirty-one thematic ideas (DeVoto 1984). The implications of DeVoto's thematic inventory are pursued in a Figure that lays out his thematic count on one axis and a measure count on the other axis. This leads to a reassessment of Berg's thematic and formal processes in the work. We turn next to the formal evidence of the sketches, then examine a particularly detailed sketch for the opening. It is shown that Berg establishes a texture of 'multiple counterpoint' from which he can unravel subsequent thematic combinations. In the course of our analytical observations, we examine relevant sketches for the initial conception of individual sections, and we uncover several 'late' changes at the Particell stage, changes which begin with a 'false start' for the piece as a whole. We also revisit the problem of the *Wozzeck* quotation in the *Marsch* in the light of documentary evidence that includes the sketches for both works as well as the *Symphonie-Fragment*. 
Analysis of the second half of the Marsch (m.91ff) begins with a reflection on the paucity of sketches. I then go on to show how Particell and score are based on a relatively straightforward large-scale structure led by a single thematic idea (beginning at m.91) that serves as a header to the remaining major formal subdivisions (m.107, m.149; and, less obviously, m.127 and m.171). Within this large-scale design, the formal interjections (at the thematic level), interpolations (at the sectional level), and invasions of conventional voice-leading and quasi-tonal cadential focus (in the later passages) give the surface structure a considerably more chaotic appearance than the deeper-level organization might predict. The result is a kind of "form-functional asthma" and it demonstrates how Berg realized his Marsch eines Astmatikers in ways that go well beyond the off-beat wheezings of the opening rhythms.

In as much as this introductory chapter has been a somewhat prolix "Präludium" to our study, the next chapter—which tells the story of the composition of Opus 6—forms a restive "Reigen"; a chaining together of the biographical circumstances, and bibliographical detours, that brought the work into being: "ein Entstehungsreigen," so to speak, to which we now turn.
Notes to Chapter 1, Introduction:

1Berg stopped giving opus numbers to his works after Wozzeck, in part (according to Reich 1963, 109; 1965, 118) because he was embarrassed by the low count, which would indeed only have reached a dozen or—perhaps worse for the numerologically-influenced Berg—thirteen, if we include the orchestral version of the Seven Early Songs.

2Headlam 1993 provides a more general survey of what he calls the “three eras” of Berg scholarship, with divisions at Redlich 1957a and, roughly, at Perle and Green (both 1977) or R. Hilmar 1980, in the preamble to his reviews of Gable and Morgan 1991 and Adorno 1991.

3The first volume of the Schoenberg-Berg-Webern correspondence has recently been announced.

4The dissonance in the music-theoretical community concerning the somewhat “maverick” nature of Perle’s contributions within that discipline need not concern us here in this survey of his work on Berg. Recent discussion appears in Richard Cohn’s review of Perle’s The Listening Composer (Perle 1990; review Cohn 1991), in Perle’s perhaps oblique response to Cohn care of a communication about Lewin 1990, and in Dave Headlam’s exchange with Cohn (both 1994). Perle’s more direct exchange with Cohn followed in 1995.

5I have presented additional information about the secret programme of the Lyric Suite based on documents contained in the Julius Schloß collection at McGill University; in particular, I have shown that the fifth movement is also associated with a subtext based on the Baudelaire-George poem “Herbst-Sonett” (McLean 1988).

6Schmalfeldt’s introduction is recommended to non-specialists approaching my study as well. It should be sufficient grounding for most of the relatively straightforward pitch-class set identifications undertaken here. More thorough—yet still gentle—introductory expositions of the method include: Rahn 1980, Straus 1990, and the excellent Morris 1991.

7See the shorter studies, Caplin 1986 and 1987, and his monograph, Classical Form: a theory of formal function for the instrumental music of Haydn, Mozart, and Beethoven, forthcoming from Oxford University Press. Portions of the latter, as a work-in-progress, were used in my teaching at McGill. Ratz’s work, Einführung in die musikalische Formenlehre (3rd ed., 1973), is considerably better known in Europe than it is here; Ratz develops and
extends Schoenberg concepts of the musical ‘sentence’ and ‘period’, elaborates ‘continuation’ and ‘liquidation’ functions, and coins the expression ‘standing on the dominant’ for a particularly prominent harmonic-formal phenomenon. Schoenberg’s emphasis on the principles of thematic construction based on motives in two-measure phrases (what, following Caplin, we will term a ‘basic idea’), his discussion of the techniques for their subsequent development, and his assessment of the different functions of the traditional small-form and sonata-form sections may often be found manipulated and transformed in Berg’s approach to formal design in Opus 6. See my discussion of the analysis of formal function in this chapter.

It is interesting to note that these measure number assignments for formal subdivisions do not match those provided by Adorno (1991, 83); this leads one to speculate about just how well-informed the inner-circle might have been in such matters.

Richard Taruskin (1988), somewhat to excess, takes James Baker to task over this matter of systemic dichotomy in his review of Baker’s monograph on Scriabin (1986).

The Yale monograph series, Composers of the twentieth century: Van den Toorn 1983 on Stravinsky, Baker 1986 on Scriabin, Neumeyer 1986 on Hindemith, Bernard 1987 on Varèse, Parks 1989 on Debussy, Wilson 1992 on Bartók. The studies by Baker, Parks, and Wilson explicitly seek modified prolongational models, as Neumeyer does while incorporating aspects of Hindemith’s own theories into his analytical graphs; Van den Toorn and Bernard take quite different approaches but are also often concerned with the projection of referential collections, which I take to be an aspect of structural voice-leading analysis.

One might surmise from the tone of this commentary that Laufer finds the application of Schenkerian principles to post-tonal music an entirely dubious undertaking, but he is actually only acknowledging the inherent problems. Some of these problems are apparent in Laufer’s highly interesting unpublished studies of numerous post-tonal works (1986, also 1991, and 1993); he remains one of the few well-known Schenkerians who has made extensive applications to later music.

Given a clear enough context—as Roger Sessions has said: “It is of course the task of the composer to make his contexts quite clear, and that of the listener to become aware of the inner logic of the music—in its own terms, and not with reference to something outside the music, unless such reference may clearly impose itself as the result of an evident intent on the composer’s part (1979, 219).” Berg’s “contexts” are not always “quite clear” in Opus 6, and some of his external programmatic references rather obscure, but the
composer's careful coordination of referential sonorities and formal functions clarifies a good deal. Morrison 1991 contains a useful review of the post-tonal prolongation problem with a structural voice-leading analysis of the final movement of Bartók's Fourth String Quartet; in particular, Morrison describes the work's "departure-return pattern" and comments on its contextual establishment of a "lydian-phrygian polymode" hierarchy of related scale-steps using William Benjamin's concept of "disposition pairs" (Benjamin 1978).

13Schenker's fundamental line (Urlinie) is itself a 'linear progression' (Zug) between the members of the triadic referential sonority. Lerdahl (1989, 75), in a corollary to his critique of Straus 1987, denies the possibility of linear progressions in atonal music, but we shall see something decidedly like such entities in Opus 6, particularly in the Präludium.

14My own undergraduate interest in contour theory was reinforced in a conversation concerning musical universals with the author of an article on the then (1970s) rather uncommon subject (Kolinski 1965). More recent music-theoretical studies of contour include: Friedmann 1985, Marvin and Laprade 1987, Friedmann 1987, and Morris 1987, as well as Morris 1993. Morris's theory of contour is derived from his concept of c-space (contour space) where the number (n) of c-pitches (cps) under consideration are assigned integers (from 0 to n–1) from low to high register without regard to the intervallic distances between them. Contour comparisons can then be made between different statements (Morris 1987, 26–33). These comparisons normally concern melodic statements (associations between pitch and time) and are the type we consider in this study; however, the potential Cartesian generality has been noted by Morris (1987, 283): "A contour is a set of points in one sequential dimension ordered by any other sequential dimension." Morris (1993, 212–215) also defines a "contour-reduction algorithm" that effects a "hierarchical model of contour relations" (effectively by pruning maxima and minima in a series of leveled steps), and establishes "general contour types" (1993: Example 28, p.227).

15Thus, in a typical eight-measure period, consequent function normally begins in the fifth measure and consists of a restatement of the b.i. followed by a reworking (from simple metrical relocation to considerable change) of the c.i. in a relatively stronger cadential progression (routinely a perfect authentic cadence). By extension, the consequent of a sixteen-measure tonal period can begin like, and show the sentence structure of, its eight-measure antecedent, but will conclude with a relatively stronger cadence.

16This results in what Caplin has called a "hybrid" type; in the case described, antecedent function, a feature of periodic structure, is followed by continuation function, a feature of sentence structure.
2 The Composition of Opus 6: "ein Entstehungsreigen"

On the 25th of February, 1912, Berg travelled from Vienna to Prague to attend a performance of Schoenberg's Pelleas und Melisande (29-02-12). That evening, at the home of Schoenberg's brother-in-law, Alexander von Zemlinsky, the first copy of Arnold Schönberg, a book of homage written by Schoenberg’s students and friends, which had been arduously assembled under Berg’s editorship, was formally presented to Schoenberg by Anton Webern.

Schoenberg found himself moved, but the strength of the praise left him with mixed feelings, as he expressed in his diary the same evening:

I find there was much too effusively spoken of me there. I am too young for this praise, have yet achieved too few and too few finished works. My achievements until now I can always only still look upon as a hope for the future, thus a promise, that I perhaps will keep.

This momentary self-doubt comes at the end of a period of intense compositional activity which saw the creation of the Georgelieder, the op. 16 Orchesterstücke, Erwartung, the op. 11 Klavierstücke, and Die glückliche Hand: "a body of works we now recognize as the epicentre of the development of our musical language (Stravinsky 1982a, 105)."
Schoenberg was concerned for three reasons: (1) he felt, with *Die glückliche Hand* still unfinished and *Pierrot lunaire* not yet begun, that his creative drive had started to founder; (2) he felt pushed by the innovative intensity of his students (particularly Berg and Webern); and (3) he felt that his recent emphasis on theoretical matters had made him lose his creative edge. He puts it this way, again to his diary (12-03-12):³

This morning I suddenly had the greatest urge to compose. After such a long time! I had already thought it possible that I might actually never compose again. It seems there are several reasons for that. The obstinacy with which my students are at my heels, in which they strive to outbid what I bid, poses the danger of my becoming their imitator, and hinders me from developing in peace .... They all bring [me work in which] everything is raised to the tenth power. And it works! It is really good. But I don’t know whether it is necessary. ... Then came the occupation with theoretical matters [the *Harmonielehre* of 1911]. With that one decidedly dries up. And perhaps that is the reason, why, over the last two years, I suddenly don’t feel so young. I have become noticeably more quiet. Even in conducting it shows. I am lacking in “the aggressive.”

**Schoenberg’s State of Mind**

§

**Berg’s Orchestral Plans**

Berg had been under some friendly pressure from both Schoenberg and Webern to compose an orchestral work. Indeed, Berg was dependent on his teacher for charting his output, the intermittent nature of which caused Schoenberg concern (13-01-12):⁴

I received your scores [Opp. 1-3] and was very happy to see the sonata again. It really is a very beautiful and original piece. Why aren’t you composing anything! You shouldn’t let your talent rest so long. Write a few songs, at least. It’s a good idea to let poetry lead one back into music. After that: something for orchestra.
How's your composing? You never mention it. You should see to it. Perhaps a few songs for the time being!! Perhaps orchestral songs!

Following Schoenberg's advice, Berg's own orchestral efforts began to materialize around March of 1912 as a song cycle, what was eventually to become the Altenberglieder—a work quite 'at Schoenberg's heels' in its innovation. Altenberg's texts had not been his first choice, as we find out in a letter to Webern (29-07-12) in response to the latter's 'latest news' of Schoenberg's current plans:

Your letter, dear friend, ... has moved me deeply. Namely, the news that Schoenberg is working on a stage work based on [Balzac's] Seraphita. That is colossal! With music yet?! God! What will be granted us next!! If I only think of this story, it wholly warms my heart. Now the thing with music by Schoenberg—in 3 evenings!!!

Berg goes on to other matters and then continues:

But, to return to Balzac! I will have to read Seraphita here [at the Berghof]. I brought it with me. Just think: this winter [1911-12] I intended to compose a big symphonic movement and I planned to let it end with a boy's voice (from above) singing words from—Seraphita! Of course, it remained, as so often happens in my case, only a plan.

Nothing has survived of Berg's "plan." But his exclamation concerning Schoenberg's intentions—"Was uns noch beschrieben ist!!" ['What will we be granted next!']—perhaps hides a related expression: 'Es war mir nicht beschrieben.' ['It was not granted to me.'] Now that Berg had been made aware of Schoenberg's plans for a substantial work based on Seraphita, there was assuredly no possibility of continuing or reactivating his own.
The *Seraphita* issue must be raised here because considerable confusion has arisen over the years concerning a number of *real* and *pseudo* 'symphonic' documents in the Berg Nachlaß—all of which impinge on our story of Opus 6. Two *real* documents—a *Passacaglia-Fragment* and a *Symphonie-Fragment*—are now published together as *Symphonie-Fragmente*, a “Separatum” (Berg 1984) to the Collected Works edition. We will deal with both of these as our story proceeds. The *Seraphita* plan is one of the two *pseudo* documents; the other ‘proto-Opus 6’ item supposedly consisted of a symphonic “adagio” which “became the interlude before the last scene in the opera *Wozzeck*.” “The inclusion of this passage in *Wozzeck* was the result of a suggestion made by Frau Helene Berg.” In particular, it was the “melodic remnant” of the Symphonie which was employed in *Wozzeck*. “Presumably, this refers to the principal theme, in D minor, and the sections (of the interlude) based upon it, since everything else in the interlude is derived from material found elsewhere in the opera.”

There is, however, no reference to the opening melodic idea of the final *Wozzeck* interlude in the real *Symphonie-Fragmente* as published. There is also no reference to *Seraphita*, or to a concluding vocal part of any kind in the fragments. The melodic idea for the *Wozzeck* interlude comes, rather, from one of Berg’s pre-Opus 1 Sonatas. And the “*Seraphita* Symphony” probably remained, as Berg said: “nur beim Plan.”

---

The text is an excerpt from a discussion on the real and pseudo symphonic documents in the Nachlaß of Anton Webern. It details the confusion and the different interpretations of the role of the *Seraphita* plan in the creation of the opera *Wozzeck*. The mention of *Symphonie-Fragmente* and *Passacaglia-Fragment* highlights the importance of these documents in the story of Opus 6. The text also delves into the background and the creation process of the symphonic ideas, emphasizing the role of Frau Helene Berg in the inclusion of the adagio in the opera.
Berg’s Orchestral Plans
§
Op. 4 and the Passacaglia-Fragment

Always a great admirer of Mahler’s works, Berg was profoundly moved by the posthumous premiere (26-02-12) of Mahler’s Ninth Symphony, a work often cited as a major influence on the Opus 6 pieces.9 No doubt this gave his orchestral plans fresh impetus. But first he wanted to finish the op. 4 songs. As he said to Webern (29-07-12):10

Hopefully, I’ll do some work up there [he was moving to his wife’s family estate in Trahütten]. At least finish the five orchestral songs! And afterwards in Vienna something big—I feel it enormously urgent and compelling. If only my health holds!

Berg had completed song 4 by 10-03-12, song 3 sometime between April and July. Illness and continued work on piano-vocal arrangements of the last two movements of Schoenberg’s Opus 10 Quartet slowed down progress on the next song.11 But, in a reply (05-09-12) to Webern’s congratulatory letter of 30-08-12, Berg’s description makes it clear that he had completed Song 5—the passacaglia (“Hier ist Friede”).12

The op.4, no.5 passacaglia encroaches upon our Opus 6 story because of its relation to one of the two Symphonie-Fragmente. Though they are now housed in different collections, the Passacaglia-Fragment (A-Wst MH 14.265/c) has been associated with, and published (Berg 1984) together with, the Symphonie-Fragment (part of A-Wn F 21 Berg 53) on the grounds that sketches for the former are found in the Nachlaß item that contains sketches for the latter (as well as the Fragment itself). In brief, Berg 53 consists of a sheaf of manuscript of varying sizes and formats. A sketch for the Symphonie is found on folio 10; bifolio pages 11v and 12 contain the 41-
measure Fragment in Particell. Folios 7-9 of the same Signatur, however, show sketches for two different passacaglias. Folio 9 (transcribed but not reproduced in facsimile in Berg 1984) shows the theme of the *Passacaglia-Fragment*; folio 8 contains the same theme and sketches for two variations. Folio 8v has a different theme, in G minor; and folio 7v sketches three variations on it. Both passacaglia themes should be compared with the theme for op.4, no.5.

The three different themes are reproduced in Example 2.1 (on the next page). Though obviously distinct entities, the themes show certain similarities in design and pitch content. Item F on the Example is the theme of the *Passacaglia-Fragment*; Item G is the G-minor theme; and Item H is the five-note theme from op.4, no.5. As Rudolf Stephan points out in his Introduction to the facsimile edition, Berg, in drafting the ten-plus variations that constitute the Fragment, has used the 21-note passacaglia theme [item F] "not as a theme in any traditional sense but rather as a mere sequence of notes from which every possible kind of musical configuration can be derived." Stephan concludes: "there can be no doubt that the present sketch for an orchestral passacaglia occupies a place beside the passacaglias in the 'Altenberg-Lieder' [op. 4, no.5] and the opera 'Wozzeck' [I/4] in the musical antecedents of serial composition (Berg 1984, 8–9)."

My Example 2.1 shows that this proto-serial quality also assists us in accounting for certain similarities between the three themes. Figure 2.1, the annotation to Example 2.1, summarizes. There, I begin with item H, the 'bare-bones' five-note theme of op.5, no.4, "Hier ist Friede": in pitch-class (pc) integers, H=<78A14>. This pc-set is a representative of set-class (SC) 5–31 [01369].
Example 2.1: "Passacaglia Themes"

Figure 2.1: Pitch-class set comparison of the passacaglia themes:

**Item H:** Op. 4, No. 5 “Hier ist Friede”—
- five-note initial bass motive:
  - in pitch-class integers: 7 8 A 1 4

**Item F:** the Passacaglia-Fragment (transcr.)—
- the initial notes of which are:
  - in pitch-class integers: 5 A 1 4 7

**Item G:** the G-minor theme (facsimile)—
- the initial notes of which are:
  - in pitch-class integers: 7 8 9 A 3 4 2 1
  - structurally emphasized tones: 7 8 A 4 1

The pitch-class sets underlying the openings of all three themes are representatives of set-class 5–31 [01369]: H=<78A14>; F=<5A147> is equivalent to T9H=<457A1> and is maximally invariant with H in pc content; the emphasized pcs of G=<78A41> are identical to those of H, the order of the final two pcs reversed.
Item F, the twenty-one-note Passacaglia-Fragment theme, is obviously a much longer object with an entirely different rhythmic profile; nonetheless, it is interesting to observe that its first five pcs also constitute a representation of SC 5–31: in normal order F=<5A1(5)47> is equivalent to T9H=<457A1>; furthermore, opening sets F and H are maximally invariant with respect to pc content (H has pc8, Ab; F has pc5, F; pcs 1, 4, 7, and A[=Bb] are in both).

In Item G, the G-minor theme, the alternating metrical emphasis set up by the initial pickup, coupled with (in conventional tonal terms) the obvious passing or neighbouring nature of certain tones, forms the basis of my selection of the structurally emphasized tones: in pc integers, the opening of G=<78A41>. Though the affinity between H and the opening of G is perhaps apparent enough to most ears without this demonstration, it is notable that these emphasized pcs turn out to be identical to the pcs of H (thus obviously also an instance of SC 5–31); only the order of the last two pcs is reversed.

I hope it is obvious that I do not mean to suggest by this demonstration that these are all somehow the same piece—certainly their further workings out belie that idea. But it does strike one that they are all variant solutions to a single compositional problem. And the clinching piece of associative evidence is found on page [6] of the Passacaglia-Fragment. Pages 5 and 6 form a single leaf. Page 5 breaks off with the eleventh and final variation of the Passacaglia-Fragment. The leaf has been folded horizontally, and the lower half of page 6 contains a brief sketch which, though somewhat rough, is unquestionably the oboe theme (m. 11; returning in voice and violin, m. 36) of op.4, no.5.¹³

Given this final documentary link, the time gap between songs 3 and 5, the desire to do "something big for orchestra," and the most obvious fact that all three items are passacaglias: it seems probable that Berg attempted an
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It is worth mentioning that Schoenberg himself was not entirely 'pleased right off' with Berg's songs (see his letter to Berg, 14–01–13). Nonetheless, another singer was found. Alfred Borutta was scheduled, he had absolute pitch and rehearsed the chosen items, songs 2 and 3, without difficulty. But the actual concert scene, as reported in one newspaper was so spectacularly scandalous that it could be worn—though only ten years later—as a badge of honour by the Schoenberg circle: the review was reprinted in the next Arnold Schönberg book (1924, for Schoenberg's fiftieth birthday). The most damaging statement for Berg was made in a review in Die Zeit (02–04–13): the tumult, which had broken out during the Berg songs and which had necessitated the closing down of the concert amidst shouts and fisticuffs, was deemed grounds for publicly urging Emil Hertzka of Universal Edition not to publish Berg's work. Berg never attempted to have the songs performed again during his lifetime; they were first published in 1953.

The Op. 4 Skandalkonzert
§
Berg's Symphonic Plans

Despite the disaster, when Berg finally managed to recompose himself, he declared his intentions to Schoenberg (24–04–13):

I'm continuing the pieces for clarinet and piano. There will probably be 4–6 short pieces, which I intend to finish in a few weeks in order—after the Berlin trip—to begin a symphony. Hopefully my asthma won't hinder me ...

At the end of May, Schoenberg had just moved into new quarters in Berlin; Berg's visit began on the fourth of June, and lasted about a week. On
the last afternoon, as Berg’s subsequent letter (14–06–13) shows, something went wrong:

... You will certainly understand, dear Herr Schoenberg, that together with these most beautiful memories of untroubled enjoyment, there also intrudes those of the last afternoon, with its, for me, depressing truths. But I have to thank you even for your censure [Tadel], as much as for everything else I have received from you, knowing well that it is all meant—for my own good. I need also not tell you, dear Herr Schoenberg, that my deep pain is assurance that I am taking the criticism [Tadel] to heart. And—should this undertaking [Vornahme] of mine be successful—which I admittedly hope for, though with uneasy tension at best (for my self-doubt is so strong that the slightest reproof [Tadel] from your singularly competent direction robs me of almost all hope)—should, then, this good resolve [Vornahme] of mine be successful, then, too, would this pain have lost its bitterness and it would belong only to those memories which—as always when you appeal to my conscience with inexorable truth—despite the resultant depresisions—have fully deeper, if also more serious, more sorrowful beauty.

Hopefully I can show you in deeds what I am unable to express in words. As soon as I am in the country I will begin the Suite. Perhaps I shall be able to compose something cheerful for once!

What precisely was the nature of Schoenberg’s “Tadel”? What were its “depressing truths”? Given Berg’s reiterative hopes and doubts about his “resolve” and his identification of the creative means of accomplishing that resolve as the undertaking of an orchestral Suite, it can only be that Schoenberg found fault with Berg’s latest works: the Clarinet Pieces, which he probably showed during the Berlin visit; and, perhaps also—now that Schoenberg had had more time to reflect upon them—the Altenberglieder as well. These were the first works which Berg had completed without Schoenberg’s in-progress supervision. And the Songs, with their innovative ideas “raised to the tenth power,” were also the mutually embarrassing termination point of the Skandalkonzert.
The idea of composing a “Suite,” which is mentioned for the first time in this letter (04-06-13), was evidently Schoenberg’s, and was put to Berg during the Berlin visit. This, therefore, altered Berg’s previously stated plan—“to begin a symphony.” When Berg makes a progress report (09-07-13), however, things had apparently become confused:

I am free of all asthmatic complaints: shortness of breath, hayfever, etc., although I go for hour-long hikes [Märsche] and am much outside and in all kinds of weather—and I’m working. Unfortunately I have to confess, dear Herr Schoenberg, that I have not made use of your various proposals as to what I should compose next. Your advice that I should write an orchestral suite (with character pieces) appealed to me from the very start, and I gave it a great deal of thought and fully intended to carry it out; and yet it has not come about. Again and again I saw myself pressed to give way to a long-standing desire—namely to write a symphony. And, as I made a concession to this need, and [as I then] set out to begin the suite with a prelude, I found (as I began to work on it) that it again merely turned into the opening of the symphony. So I am going on with it: —it will be a large symphony in a single movement, naturally containing in it the 4 respective movements or sections, with developments etc. Along the lines of the Chamber Symphony [Schoenberg’s Op. 9] in its structures. Meanwhile the plan for the suite will undoubtedly mature to an extent that I will really get round to writing it at some stage, and your kind suggestion will be realized—albeit rather late. I hope with all my strength that you won’t be angry with me for postponing the realization of your suggestion. That you will not regard it as willfulness! You yourself know, dear Herr Schoenberg, that I am always conscious of, and never wish to be conscious of anything but: being your student. To follow you in every respect, knowing that everything I do in opposition to your wishes is wrong. If in the last months I have thought so often and intensely of composing a symphony, then this must largely have been because I wanted to make up for what I would have worked on under your[r supervision], dear Herr Schoenberg, had you stayed in Vienna; and because I wanted to heed your precept that ‘Each of your pupils ought to have written a symphony.’—

...
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Berg’s 58 notebooks (A-Wn F 21 Berg 470/1–58 Notizhefte) form an important, though often erratic and scarcely legible, source of information spanning his entire career. Notizheft Nr. 44 contains three brief (and very rough) sketches for the Marsch (perhaps also one for the Präludium) which, on the basis of dated monthly balance entries ["Neue Verrechnung(en)"], can be placed around July of 1913, i.e., following the Berlin visit. There are three later sketches in the Notizhefte: circa November 1913, circa 23–01–14 (both in Nr. 49), and circa May 1914 (Nr. 48). Though the roughness of these sketches makes them of slight musical significance, it is important to establish that tentative sketches for the Marsch appear as early as July of 1913.

Perhaps even earlier! More amazing is the discovery of a faint but unmistakable rhythmic sketch for the opening of the Marsch which is found on folio 20v of Altenberglieder sketchbook (A–Wn F 21 Berg 65). The same page also contains a "detail" sketch for the double bass part of mm.15–17 of op.4, no.1. Since the position on the page suggests that the Marsch sketch was there first, one is obliged to consider the possibility that Berg began sketching the Marsch while he was still working of the final Altenberglieder; i.e., during the summer of 1912. Such a date would place sketches for Opus 6 a full year earlier than previously thought. The documentary details surrounding folio 20v—in the archival state of Berg 65, the last page of the sketches—involves a reconstructive merging of sketch sources that I undertake in Chapter 3 (fol.20v itself is transcribed in Chapter 7, p.386).

Progress on my symphony has been slow recently. A number of unpleasant incidents of a domestic nature have robbed me of the peace of mind which I need to work. To date I have written approximately a quarter of the symphony’s single movement, which when finished will have a duration of half to three-quarters of an hour. Of course I have not written it in full score. That I will probably leave until I am in Vienna, so that I can get as far as possible with the sketch of the whole movement while I am here [Trahütten].

If Berg, in this letter to Schoenberg, is referring to the brief sketches of the Stadtbibliothek (A-Wst) sketchbook, he is greatly overestimating his state of symphonic progress. And yet, it seems even less likely that he would be referring to the document now published as the Symphonie-Fragment (and discussed in our next section). Given the relatively undeveloped state of its surviving Particell, the Fragment fails to provide a good match to Berg’s formal description of his compositional progress. Berg’s sense of having “written approximately a quarter of the symphony’s single movement” is, on the other hand, precisely matched by his having sketched the “A” section of the projected symphonic “A, B, C, D” in the A-Wst sketchbook—perhaps even by his having extended those sketches to the “piano sketches” which now form the core of the Präludium Particell.

The idea that the Präludium sketches—despite being intended (in July of 1913) for the projected Suite—kept turning into the first section of the symphony is well-matched by Berg’s description to that effect in his letter to Schoenberg (09–07–13, quoted above). That situation also properly explains Berg’s comments a year later (14–07–14) in a letter to his wife. Having finished the Marsch and setting about the draft of the Präludium, Berg writes: ²⁹

I’m using for it [the Präludium] much [of the musical material] of the symphony which I began last year in Trahütten—it evidently wasn’t meant to become any such thing. It didn’t develop much beyond the
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work (Berg 1984, 7).” My own investigations suggest that the two works are separate undertakings: I have found no evidence in the sketchbook sources for Opus 6 (nor, for that matter, in the materials for op.4 and op.5) that pertains to the two Fragments. In particular, there is nothing to connect either Fragment with Berg’s symphonic plan as found in the Stadtbibliothek sketchbook, and no other plan is known.

Earlier, I suggested that the Passacaglia-Fragment is best understood as a “study” for op.4, no.5. One might also wonder whether the Symphonie-Fragment served a similar purpose for Opus 6. The Fragment is, of course, clearly an independent entity: it does not strike us immediately as a sketch for, or a draft of, any particular passage of Opus 6. The robust nature of the Fragment’s Bewegter main theme is perhaps most compatible in character with the Opus 6 Marsch, though it anticipates no theme in particular. Nonetheless, the (largely) unison theme shows a rather relentless motivic construction that juxtaposes and interlocks trichordal cells of type [014] and [016]; namely, the two cells which are also generative in Opus 6. In the Fragment, this trichordal motivic construction is even more apparent when the tune is repeated at m.20ff: its counterpoint is also built from the same cells.

The Fragment introduction features a typical Bergian additive rhythmic pattern beginning from a four-note chromatic cluster subtended from Eb3. Though such a rhythmic procedure is, in itself, too ubiquitous in Berg’s music to serve as a qualifier of attribution, the choice of E-flat as a pitch-class referent certainly reminds us of the ‘Hauptrhythmus’ of the Präludium. As a whole, however, the Fragment introduction shares considerably more features with mm.79–83 of the Marsch. (This is a highly significant passage in Opus 6; we will revisit it twice more before this Chapter}
NOTE TO USERS

Page(s) not included in the original manuscript are unavailable from the author or university. The manuscript was microfilmed as received.
Notwithstanding this discussion of the relations between Opus 6 and the *Symphonie-Fragment*, it is important to acknowledge that the association of the name “Symphonie” with the published Fragment is quite authentic. Folio 11 of A-Wn F 21 Berg 53 has, in blue pencil, Berg’s autograph scrawl—“Symphonie.” Similarly, folio 6v shows “Präludium,” and the first folio of the sheaf has Roman numeral “I” and the curious remark “Vorschönbergische Komposition.” It would appear that these designations are ‘filing labels,’ the sheets once used as bifolio folders or as single-sheet dividers in a folder containing various materials (which is, after all, what Berg 53 now is).

The first folios of Berg 53 contain rough, unidentifiable tonal fragments. It is difficult precisely to determine what Berg intends by the “Vorschönbergisch” label; the musical hand does not suggest a chronological (i.e., pre-1904) interpretation, but then perhaps Berg was defining the filing category in terms of ‘style-chronology’—the items are in a ‘pre-Schoenbergian’ idiom.

Folio 6v is described (though not reproduced) in the “Introduction” to the facsimile edition as “an early sketch (in ink) for the Orchesterstück op. 6 Nr. 1.” Presumably, it is deemed “an early sketch” because of a discrepancy in one rhythmic detail between the melodic idea as written and the finished score. However, it seems quite clear that the item is not a sketch at all but a pen trial. In addition to the melodic fragment, there are several individual noteheads, clefs, and rests. Moreover, the page tabulates the instruments and number of players required for all three pieces. Since this corresponds exactly to a tabulation found at the beginning of the Particell, we may reasonably conclude that this folio dates from the time of the fair copy, August 1914.

The “Symphonie” label is reproduced in the facsimile edition. It is the first page of a bifolio (fol.11–12); the *Symphonie-Fragment* draft is on interior
facing pages (11v–12); the last page (12v) is blank. As a bifolio, this Syphonie-Fragment could have been used as a folder. As such, it not only now contains the Syphonie-Fragment on its pages, it may at one time have contained various sheets of sketches and drafts for additional materials pertaining to the Symphony project between them. Precisely when Berg labelled the three sections of what became A–Wn F 21 Berg 53 is not known, but it must have been after the shape of Opus 6 was finalized; that is, after the function of the Präludium was determined (14–07–14), and when the remaining “Symphonie” materials were abandoned to fragment. Those abandoned materials, which I have suggested are a “study” for Opus 6, became the published Syphonie-Fragment.

The Syphonie-Fragment
§
Berg’s Programmatic Solution

In a letter of 10–09–13, Berg tells Schoenberg that, while in Trahütten, he is studying the latter’s Opus 16 pieces, which had recently appeared in Webern’s two-piano reduction. A month later (03–10–13), back in Vienna, Berg tells Schoenberg that he hopes to continue work on his symphony. This is the last time the symphony project is mentioned.

On the 27th of January, 1914, Berg made a brief trip to Prague to attend Zemlinsky’s performance of three songs from Schoenberg’s Opus 8. On the 24th of February, 1914, Berg wrote to Universal Edition’s Emil Hertzka to seek an advance on the Gurrelieder concert guide as financial support to undertake a more extended trip. He went to Leipzig for the Gurrelieder
performance of 06–03–14 and, via Berlin, on to Amsterdam for the performance (12–03–14) at which Schoenberg conducted his Opus 16 pieces."

On the return trip, Berg received a second strong critique from Schoenberg. One might suspect it concerned the slowness of his progress on the orchestral project, but it apparently also encompassed matters of a more personal nature—his lifestyle, how he dressed, how he expressed himself, how illegible his handwriting was, etc.39

After the Amsterdam trip, Berg lived in constant fear that anything he did might engender Schoenberg's censure. He seems to have struck upon a working solution. He turned himself, his own personal condition, into the inspirational basis for the requested character pieces. Specifically, the Marsch Finale was to become the "Marsch eines Astmatikers" (10–04–14):40

As of the last three days I have finally been able to work; the plan for a fairly large movement, which shall portray [vorsotten] a march, is finished, as are a number of the sections; unfortunately my wife is ailing again. Her continually increasing rheumatic and neuralgic pains have brought on a high and prolonged fever, which still hasn't completely subsided. With the coming of spring my asthma, too, has reappeared. Sufficient conditions, you see, for at last writing something cheerful. Maybe for once it will work in reverse!: If what I write doesn't match what I have experienced, then perhaps my life will for once conform to my compositions, which, in that case, would be purest prophecy. But I think I lack that power as I lack so many others, and even if I for once manage with extreme effort to avoid "the tears", it will still probably not be the march of an upright person marching cheerfully, but rather, at best—in which case it would at least be a "character piece"—the "March of an Asthmatic," which I am and will, it seems to me, remain forever. —

Berg continued to sketch his Marsch eines Astmatikers in the Spring of 1914. These sketches are found in A–Wn F 21 Berg 13/ii (described in Chapter 3). The first half of this bound sketchbook concerns the Marsch; the second half of the book contains the earliest known sketches for Wozzeck. In
the middle of this source, then, the continuing story of Opus 6 and the first chapter in the story of the opera overlap. Indeed, they collide: the sketches for the Opus 6 Marsch are crammed up against the border.

In our present context, acknowledgement of certain ‘cross-border relations’ is instructive. The Captain’s decidedly ‘asthmatic’ character (verbally described on page 57 of Berg 13/ii) was conceived at the same time Berg was composing his Marsch eines Astmatikers. The most extensive of the early Wozzeck sketches in Berg 13/ii are for Act II, Scene 2: the triple fugue (Captain, Doctor, Wozzeck), which naturally shares a number of the combinational principles that (in Chapter 7) I will characterize as the Marsch’s ‘multiple-counterpoint’ texture. Sketches of dance motives for the opera (cf. the Ländler/Waltz of II/4, and the Polka of III/3), though all ultimately discarded, remind us that Berg’s Reigen began as a “Walzer” for the projected Suite and is first given its proper title in a letter to his wife (13-07-14) where it is described as “a very tender, also cheerful, piece of dancelike character.”

Finally, the three-chord ‘chaconne’ basis of the field scene, Act I, scene 2, with Wozzeck and Andres (though the chords in Berg 13/ii are far from their final version) recalls the more extensive chordal progression that (in Chapter 4) we shall see underlies the Präludium (a chordal progression first sketched in A-Wst MH 14.263/c, p.39).

For those familiar with Opus 6, the presence in Berg 13/ii of an early sketch for Act I, scene 2 of the opera begs a documentary question: is the sketch for the “hallucination motive” (1/2, mm.274–279), since that passage is ‘quoted’ in the Marsch (mm.79–83)? The short answer is no: the sketches for Act I, Scene 2 do not include that passage. The astute reader will have noted that this is the same passage that we referred to in our discussion of the Symphonie-Fragment, and we will reconsider the documentary problem, in slightly more elaborate form, at the end of this section.
Berg's student Gottfried Kassowitz has stated that Berg began work on 
Wozzeck almost immediately after he saw the production of the Büchner 
play (05-05-14). In fact, we may speculate that the premiere so galvanized 
Berg's creative impulse that the combination of work on the Marsch coupled 
with the flood of preliminary ideas for Wozzeck contributed to his 
commission of the oversight which most severely affected his relations with 
Schoenberg at this time.

Berg arrived at the bank too late on 23-05-14 to arrange for the transfer 
of Schoenberg's monthly stipend. Fortunately, the Schoenberg family 
received payment of the Mahler-Stiftung stipend about the same time. 
Nonetheless, Schoenberg branded Berg's handling of the matter irresponsible 
and stated that he could no longer depend on him (28-05-14): "I'm extremely 
annoyed about it [the slow transfer of funds], since I see with what little 
seriousness you took the matter. ... In any case, now I know that I cannot 
depend on you."43

In his initial response to this third attack (08-06-14), Berg states his 
plan to expunge his bad "habits [Lebensweise]": "during these past few days, 
whenever my work didn't distract me from the enlightenment that came to 
me as in a trance, I have been setting up a program for conducting my life, in 
which all the failings, some unsuspected, some heretofore unavoidable, will 
be corrected." He goes on to plead for some sign of eventual, if not 
immediate, forgiveness, "whether directly or through Webern or [Erwin] 
Stein, when you happen to write them, —one word, to which I can cling in 
my helplessness and which would give me a little courage and the ability to 
hope . . . . . . ."44 So began for Berg a very painful period of more than two 
months (28-05-14 to 08-08-14) in which Schoenberg declined to 
communicate with him directly.
It is during this dark period in his relations with Schoenberg that Berg pushed on with Opus 6. The period is of course rather dark in the broader context of world history as well: the beginning of August saw the outbreak of the War. This confluence of personal and political crises leads us to a summary consideration of the following five points:

1. While Berg sketched the Marsch he saw the play Wozzeck—the experience was a creative epiphany for him and he began almost immediately (May 1914) to make sketches for the projected opera by reserving the second half of his current sketchbook (Berg 13/ii) for it.

2. The relation between Wozzeck and his principal antagonists, the asthmatic Captain and the bullying Doctor, is established in Berg's sketches for the triple fugue (II/2). In beginning his more extensive sketching for the opera with this scene, Berg borrows a compositional procedure ('multiple-counterpoint texture') from the Marsch-in-progress. In addition, I would suggest that the scene, in its characterization of interpersonal relations, constitutes a subconscious analog for Berg's traumatically insecure relations at this time with his own authority figure, Schoenberg.

3. In July and August, in Trahütten, Berg continued with the Marsch eines Astmatikers and converted the Präludium to its Opus 6 form. (This progress is detailed in our next section.) In the process, whatever material remained for the originally projected Symphony (including perhaps the Symphonie-Fragment) was finally abandoned. And Berg's orchestral plans crystallized in a 'symphonic suite' which would end with a 'Characterstück' that portrays, at least in part, the composer himself.

4. We can well imagine the obsessive, almost hallucinatory, qualities which the gestation of this Marsch might engender in any composer. (And I have shown—in the interjection on the Altenberglieder sketch source Berg 65—that this gestation may have begun as early as July of 1912.) More
broadly, many commentators have responded to the way the piece seems to encapsulate forebodingly the socio-political crisis of the time: its ‘pre-war marche macabre character’ (Perle 1980, 18; also DeVoto 1984). The confluence of the personal and the political, the psychological and documentary may be seen in our final point for this section:

(5) We return now to the “hallucination motive” quotation. George Perle has speculated that Berg might have had an unexplained “personal and private signification (1980, 123)” for the quotation of the “hallucination motive” in the Marsch. Chronologically of course, the situation is the reverse: Berg chooses to characterize Wozzeck’s hallucinations with a motive quoted from his own ‘Characterstück’. In fact, I have also suggested, above, that the pedigree of the “hallucination-motive” may extend back to the introductory measures of the abandoned Symphony-Fragment. In the Marsch, the formal function of the passage is this: following the culminating tutti of the first half of the piece (m.76ff Etwas breiter), the “hallucination motive” appears first as the dissipation (‘codetta’) of that tutti, but soon becomes an anxiety-ridden crescendo-accelerando (a ‘retransition’) that, following a return-anticipating second acceleration in the layered ostinati of mm.83–90, instead ‘breaks out’ into the transformed second half of the piece.

Perle—though unaware of the documentary coincidence that finds early sketches for Act I, scene 2 in Berg 13/ii—also speculated that: “it is even possible that the passage is derived from material that Berg had originally sketched for Wozzeck (1980, 19).” No sketches for the Wozzeck passage are known, but it is tantalizing to note that some of the sketches for Marsch measures 79–83 (the sketches are discussed in Chapter 7) are found, in a documentary sense, precisely at the point where the two works collide; i.e., on the last page of the first half of Berg 13/ii.
"Do you hear?," says Wozzeck to Andres, "There's something following us down there!" "I feel it enormously urgent and compelling," says Berg of his gestating orchestral plans. The musical quotation seems to encapsulate the sentiment of both 'characters'; its documentary location in the sketchbook, between the Marsch and Wozzeck, would have appealed to Berg's fatalistic sensibilities, further testimony to what we have called his programmatic solution.

Berg's Programmatic Solution

§

Compositional Progress

Subsequent progress on the Marsch can be monitored in Berg's letters to his wife. The relevant contents are displayed here in tabular form [Berg 1965 = Nr. nnn; Berg 1971 = No. (nnn); in cases where longer quotation has been found desirable, the contents are first summarized in square brackets]:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Nr.</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Contents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>03-07-14</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>(142)</td>
<td>Berg plans to work in Vienna while Helene stays in Carlsbad for twenty days.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05-07-14</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>(144)</td>
<td>&quot;Working and telephoning all morning. At the piano again after lunch ... .&quot;45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06-07-14</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>(145)</td>
<td>&quot;I have been working more successfully today than I did yesterday—all morning, apart from a few interruptions.&quot;46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07-07-14</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>(147)</td>
<td>Berg works until midday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08-07-14</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>(---)</td>
<td>works until midday; and again until three</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
08–07–14  180  (148)  [longer quotation, on ideas and the path from
    inspirational experience to musical form:]

Had a hard-working day, and a successful one, with lots of important
and beautiful ideas coming up in my mind. Only hope I can summon
up the strength to put them down just as they occurred to me. But
that’s still a long way off. Nearly as far as it is from the inspiration of
an experience till the moment when it assumes musical form. Of
course many experiences never reach that stage at all, or if they do, the
form is completely lifeless!

In the middle of this successful work period, Berg responded to an
inquiry from Schoenberg (via Erwin Stein) concerning his tardiness in
producing a four-hand arrangement of the Chamber Symphony, which
he had begun to work on it immediately upon finishing the thematic table,
he had been interrupted by work on the abridged Gurrelieder concert guide,
and that since a new, revised edition of the Chamber Symphony score had
appeared in the interim—"for the time being I began to work on my own
orchestra pieces." Although it is clear from his correspondence with Helene
that Berg is immersed in his own creative work, he is prepared to yield to
Schoenberg’s priorities: “Now that nothing […] stands in the way, should I,
dear Herr Schoenberg, do the reduction right away or could it wait until mid-
September when I will be finished with my orchestra pieces. Then it would
probably take 5–7 weeks to complete.” No answer from Schoenberg (or
one via Stein) is known and the lack of response caused Berg some
consternation. Nonetheless, he chose to pursue the orchestra pieces,
although he returned to the Chamber Symphony arrangement as soon as the
Praeludium and the Marsch were completed.
10-07-14 181 (149) [on the nature of compositional problem-solving—
the obsessive aspects of the Marsch, and on the
difficulties of mixing teaching and composing:]¹⁴

I’ve been working rather successfully. The great piece, the Marsch, is
coming along nicely. I keep thinking of it all day long, and even if I am
working on other things, the work is still seething inside me. That’s
the only way I can explain to myself why some things (solutions to
particular problems), for example, don’t occur to me for a long time,
and then—for instance, after writing a letter (where one can hardly
speak of resting)—they are suddenly there. But giving lessons is a
terrible strain on me, my brain is always quite barren afterwards.
Especially when I have to think myself completely into someone else’s
ideas, to hire myself out, as it were—one finds it difficult to return to
oneself!

11-07-14 182 (150) [on the “Klavierstückerl,” on giving one’s best, and
on the dedication of Opus 6:]²⁰

How I’d love to finish writing the little piano piece [Klavierstückerl] for
you. I have thought about it a lot even this last while. But it won’t
come. Naturally, I have the capacity to join up those few measures,
which are really only a beginning, a sort of continuation, and close, but
that would be a school exercise, which even you wouldn’t like. I would
not, in that sort of work, be able to give what I would want to give: my
best. — Perhaps even the idea itself is not so original, somehow
derivative in mood and tone (although I can’t think of any model for
it); whereas, in all the other works which I have finished (even in
many of the old songs), I have always given the best of which I was
capable at the time, so that even today I can let them stand, not as
derivative, but as the authentic self-expression of Opus Numbers 1 to
5—Sonata, 4 Songs, Quartet, Picture Postcard Texts and Clarinet
Pieces—and I can, with quiet conscience, dedicate them to you,
Pferscherl.

And so, if I dedicate the new Orchestra Pieces to Schoenberg—to
whom, as my teacher, I have long been due to dedicate a large-scale
work, and who, this year in Amsterdam, outright requested these
pieces for his 40th birthday, indeed, he ordered them; he is also to be
thanked for their inspiration, both through the hearing of his
Orchestral Pieces (though mine are not—remember!—derived from
them; they are entirely different from them!) and through his
admonishing advice to write character pieces.
If, then, I do not officially dedicate these three pieces to Pferscher, there is nonetheless a good piece of Pferscher in all three, and even if she should not like them straight away, I know she will one day love them as she loves me, with all my faults and, perhaps even more than that little piano piece, should I ever finish it.

[The ‘Klavierstückerl’ requires comment. A footnote to the English edition of Berg’s letters to his wife states: “Ten years later, at Helene’s request, this ‘Klavierstückerl’ was incorporated into the score of Wozzeck, becoming the basis of the famous D minor Interlude before the last scene of Act Three.”51 We have already noted that the Wozzeck interlude derives not from the Symphonie-Fragment but from one of Berg’s pre-Opus 1 Sonatas. However, this “Fourth Sonata,” in D minor, survives in written form in conjunction with other documents all of which certainly date from 1908–1910 at the latest. Since Berg’s letter to Helene, above, implies that he had not yet written out the “Klavierstückerl,” one might wonder if this is same piece. On the other hand, we do know that, at the time of this letter, Berg had already decided to set Wozzeck and, as the second half of the Marsch sketchbook indicates, had even begun some sketches. Perhaps, then, Helene’s memory did serve her correctly, and Berg continued, on and off, to toy with this tune, until it finally found a home marking that significant moment in Wozzeck when the composer, so to speak, drops his mask—52—the initial gesture of the final tonal interlude.]

12–07–14 183 (151) Berg spends five hours at the piano.

13–07–14 184 (152) [the Marsch is near completion; the titles of the other two pieces are determined:]53

The Marsch will soon be ready (the instrumentation will await Trahütten). Here, I still want to finish [the draft of] the first of these three orchestral pieces, which I am calling Präludium. The third is the
Marsch, and the second, of which I still have very little, but which is certainly the piece which Pferscherl will like the best, is called Reigen. It will be a very tender, also cheerful, piece of dancelike character.

14-07-14 185 (153) [concerning the end of the Marsch, and on material relations between the intended symphony and the Praeludium:]^{54}

A strange day! After the midday meal and letter writing, I went back to work and wrote the close of the Marsch. I felt it was not quite right. After tea (I read the evening paper in the cafe), I tried to rectify a small fault in formal construction [Formfehler]. In the end, it was no longer clear to me what needed to be changed. One loses control and ear. It won't occur to me what's wrong until tomorrow. Or, perhaps, it's all right as is. The Marsch has become proportionally pretty lengthy. Finally a long movement, after so much short stuff! It's longer than the five orchestral songs together. I want now, while I'm still here, to finish sketching out the so-called Praeludium. [And now, the passage we quoted earlier ...] I'm using for it much [of the musical material] of the symphony which I began last year in Trahütten. It evidently wasn't meant to become any such thing. It didn't develop much beyond the "Praeludium". So it might introduce the Orchestra Pieces, instead of the symphony. — What does Pferscherl say to that?

15-07-14 186 (154) [on success with the Praeludium (the relevant passage omitted from the English edition):]^{55}

Just now received your lovely little letter. Yesterday on the way home from the city the thing which I couldn't find all morning at the piano suddenly occurred to me: perhaps my Pferscherl has been praying about this! ... I already believe that the prayer was answered. Earlier today I already had success writing the other piece. And now I'm returning to uninterrupted work. In the afternoon, I will likely stay home after lessons.

16-07-14 187 (---) time goes slowly in spite of the work
17-07-14 188 (155) people upstairs playing piano exercises!
18-07-14 189 (156) [marking the end of this work period:]^{56}

I find no joy in the work now. I am so frightfully restless that I almost have to force myself to work. In any case, everything I wanted to do
before Trahütten is done. — But whether it’s any good I don’t know. You are right, time must pass before I can judge it. Perhaps a few days will suffice.

Nonetheless, even as Berg concludes these successful work periods, letters to Webern and Schoenberg express his continuing self-doubt and his feelings of lack of support from Schoenberg. To Webern’s assurances of Schoenberg’s good will, Berg replies (18–07–14):  

Can you think how much better your words make me feel. If only you were right, dear friend! Then everything would be fine again. Meanwhile, I work without support—with changing success and satisfaction. Only now I’m troubled by the worry that I won’t be able to finish on time. That would be most annoying and Schoenberg would be right, as he wrote, that one can’t rely on me. — Unfortunately, I hear nothing at all from him. I no longer expect any news from him himself, but I await each post to see if someone else has sent me something concerning Schoenberg.

And the following passage to Schoenberg (20–07–14; the day before Berg left for Trahütten) is indicative of Berg’s almost wild concern to gain Schoenberg’s approbation for his current work, coupled with a hyperbolic self-indictment of his recent compositional efforts which stands in marked contrast to the positive assessment made for Helene just days before (11–07–14; quoted above):  

Otherwise the recent weeks have been spent working on the orchestra pieces, whose fate naturally keeps me in a constant state of apprehension. I must, after all, always ask myself whether that which I am expressing, measures of which I often brood over for days on end—is any better than the last things done. And how can I judge that! Those I hate so much that I came close to destroying them entirely, and this I can’t judge yet at all, because I’m stuck in the middle of it.

The Particell (A–Wn F 21 Berg 12) bears the date “14/VII” at the end of the Marsch, as the letter of the same day to Helene confirms. There is no date at the end of the Präludium, but Berg’s claim to have completed everything
he set out to do before Trahütten implies that the *Praeludium* was at or near completion in Particell by 18–07–14.

**Compositional Progress**

§

**The Birthday Presents**

Berg left Vienna for Trahütten 21–07–14; there, he made rapid progress in moving from Particell to full score, beginning with the *Praeludium*. Webern asked (28–07–14) if Berg had finished his compositions yet. The same day Berg wrote to Schoenberg (28–07–14): “So, it will soon be the end of July, by which time, with more peace than usual, I want to bring my orchestra pieces to completion in fair copy.”

And again to Schoenberg (02–08–14):

> It's twice as easy for me to live here as in Vienna, and I think this also affects my work. I've already finished something here, the first of the three orchestra pieces, which I'm calling *Praeludium*. At present I'm copying the *Marsch* I finished in Vienna into full score and then I have to finish the third piece, called *Reigen*, and write that out in full score. There will be only three pieces in all, they are about as long as your Orchestra Pieces and longer.

Between the two letters, Austria-Hungary declared War on Serbia (28–07–14) and allied Germany mobilized and declared war on Russia (01–08–14). By remaining in Trahütten, Berg was able to concentrate on his creative work, somewhat insulated from the turmoil in Vienna. Webern writes (05–08–14):

> "So your work is almost finished. I am already very curious." Berg must have worked very intensively on the *Marsch* orchestration during the first three weeks of August, for he neglected to write Schoenberg as frequently. This prompted Schoenberg's first direct communication (18–08–14) to Berg since the money-transfer reprimand (28–05–14).
Dear Berg, what is it with you? Why haven’t I heard from you? Have you lost all interest in me?— ...

Berg received Schoenberg’s letter on the 26th. Two days earlier he had written (24-08-14): 61

I have to gather all my strength in order to remain peacefully at work. Without that, I would be impaired by the universal, and my own particular, unrest.

It is not clear from this letter whether Berg was already working on the composition of Reigen or whether he was still completing the orchestration of the Marsch, though the latter seems more likely. The date at the end of the Marsch in both the fair copy and Berg’s own copy (both now in the Pierpont Morgan Library, US-NYpm) is 23-08-14. 64 Though the number ‘23’ was probably chosen for reasons other than chronological precision, it seems reasonable to assume that the draft copy score of the Marsch was completed very near that date. (The Präludium was probably completed earlier; recall 02-08-14 B-S, quoted above.)

Berg’s reply (27-08-14) to Schoenberg’s letter makes no reference to his compositional progress, though he discusses Schoenberg’s financial situation and the probability of their conscription. And he conveys both his happiness in Schoenberg’s direct communication after such a hiatus and his hurt feelings at Schoenberg’s accusation of disinterest. He also makes clear his intention to stay put in Trahütten. 65

Finally, just before he prepares to mail the completed fair copy of the Präludium and the Marsch, Berg needs Webern’s reassurance that Schoenberg is not angry with him. Webern conveys the wartime tensions which they were all experiencing (03-09-14): 66
In any case, he [Schoenberg] thought you might have been called up, since he didn’t hear from you. You see, what I told you, has long been the case. Schoenberg was, on the whole, never annoyed with you. It is just like a father. I must get into the war. I must. I can’t bear it any longer!

Berg sent the following letter with the presentation fair copy (08-09-14):57

Dear Herr Schoenberg, I am sending you by the same post a roll of music as registered printed matter. As I was told here, it is now [since the outbreak of the War in August] the only possibility for sending anything safely to Germany. It is, dear Herr Schoenberg, the Orchestra Pieces, dedicated to you for your birthday.

For four years it has been my secret but strong will and wish to dedicate something to you. The things, Herr Schoenberg, worked on under your supervision, the Sonata, Songs and Quartet, as they were received directly from you, were ruled out. My hopes of writing something more autonomous and yet of the same value as these first compositions, something I could dedicate to you without angering you, unfortunately eluded me through several years. Then your kind suggestion in the Spring (on the journey from Amsterdam to Berlin) gave me the courage to attempt a work which I could dedicate to you without putting myself to shame.

I cannot tell today if I have succeeded or if it remains only an attempt. Should the latter be the case, then, in your fatherly benevolence, you will have to accept the good intention in place of the deed itself. I really have tried to give of my best, to heed all of your suggestions and advice, whereby the unforgettable, indeed revelatory, experience of the Amsterdam rehearsals and the ongoing study of your orchestral pieces proved infinitely helpful and continually sharpened my self-criticism. That is also the reason that I have not forced the completion of the 2nd of the 3 pieces, Reigen, to my predetermined deadline, and why I have postponed it until later, when I shall probably succeed in correcting the flaws, which are as yet unclear to me. Another reason is that the unavoidable commotion of the last weeks caused slower progress with the work than I had projected before the outbreak of war. And so I am—once again—forced by necessity, to apologize! Please don’t be annoyed with me, dear Herr Schoenberg, that I dare to dedicate to you something that is incomplete! For I hope soon to finish the missing 2nd piece (it is a piece of dance-character, about 100 measures long, thus
longer than the *Präludium*, shorter than the *Marsch*) and to add it to the two pieces sent now.

Otherwise, I am working on the piano arrangement of the Chamber Symphony. For this purpose, I am remaining here for a time and believe I can, through this, better curb my impatience and restlessness because of the war, than if I were in Vienna. The urge 'to be in it', the feeling of helplessness at being unable to serve my country, left me unable to work there.

Please accept, dear Herr Schoenberg, my very, very warmest wishes for your birthday and many regards to you and to your esteemed wife and dear children,

from your Berg

Schoenberg acknowledged the receipt of the score, as follows (20–09–14):"

Dear Berg,

Many thanks for your birthday wishes and for the score.

Unfortunately, I can't say anything about your work as yet. Although I have looked at it often, you yourself know how difficult it is to get an impression from such a complicated score and you will understand that I haven't had the peace of mind for it during this time. I confidently expect that your intention was as good as your will and thank you for the deed.

Berg responded (28–09–14) to Schoenberg's letter after it was forwarded to Vienna from Trahütten:

I'm glad my sending the score didn't disturb you; I myself know only too well that one would rather read maps than scores these days and that it requires the greatest effort to occupy oneself with music (or, in general, with anything not related to the war). ... [Berg goes on to discuss newspaper coverage and the rife rumours of war events.] ... This uncertainty is as dreadful and agonizing as the events themselves. You will surely understand, dear Herr Schoenberg, that under such circumstances I cannot imagine how I am to work in the near future. Indeed, it sometimes seems downright wicked to think of anything but the war. If I have forced myself to do so notwithstanding—first finishing the score I sent you, then resuming work on the reduction of
the Chamber Symphony and resolved not to rest until I’ve finished it—that was and is so because of the supreme determination and purpose that have hardened within me since your reproaches in the Spring, to accomplish the work before me by all means and to let nothing deter me from my purpose.

And, indeed, the correspondence of Schoenberg, Berg, and Webern at this time shows how creative activities and musical discourse were supplanted by the mechanics (conscription, patriotism, finances, physicaIs, duty assignments, casualty reports, etc.) of the war.⁷⁰

The Birthday Presents

§

Berg’s State of Mind

During the Fall of 1914 and the Winter of 1914–15 Berg continued his studies of Schoenberg’s works (stating that he could now, in particular, “understand” the op. 16 Orchestra Pieces and Pierrot), completed his four-hand arrangement of Schoenberg’s Chamber Symphony, and went on to proofread Erwartung.⁷¹ Early in 1915, Berg also put forward an idea for a mechanical apparatus which would measure tempo fluctuations (06–01–15; Schoenberg’s reply 01–02–15). One is reminded of the prototypical ‘metric modulation’ experiments in tempo manipulation which Berg eventually works into Reigen.⁷²

Berg also continued to act as Schoenberg’s emissary in Vienna: he monitored cultural events, attending, for example, the public lectures of the pacifist and satirist Karl Kraus and sending Schoenberg recent issues of Kraus’s Die Fackel; he stepped in to organize the benefit concert 26–04–15 at which Schoenberg conducted Mahler’s retouched version of Beethoven’s Ninth Symphony as well as the Egmont overture; and he continued to
struggle with the financial status and transactions of the Schoenberg Fund.\textsuperscript{71}

Schoenberg had not been particularly pleased with the Beethoven concert, which was neither an artistic nor a financial success, and he remained concerned about the ongoing financial insecurity of his stipend. At the beginning of May, he accused Berg of "dreaming". Berg countered that he was \textit{not} dreaming, although he had been preoccupied with concert arrangements, and that his dazed appearance was caused by what we might now call a mixture of the disciple's sycophantic love, and what Berg himself recognized as fear:\textsuperscript{74}

\textit{my continual silence} doesn't prove that I don't listen when you talk, Herr Schoenberg, or that I don't take a stand on what is said, that I'm not just as delighted if at some point my opinion coincides with yours [!], or just as glad another time to correct what I recognize as a false opinion, that I don't absorb the thousands of \textit{new} impressions that grow out of your conversation with others with just as much temperament as those "wakeful" ones, who give easy expression to their enthusiasm, concurrence, and temperament. \textit{Rather}, my silence is due to fear, ever since Leipzig-Amsterdam, of annoying you with so much as the slightest remark, Herr Schoenberg, of displeasing you by emphasizing my presence; and, caught up as I am in this almost pathological self-consciousness, I become utterly thunderstruck the very moment I want to say something and at that point I make that confused dreamy—indeed idiotic impression that so justifiably annoys you. That's why I wish so fervently—as others aren't even capable of wishing (—for what are the joyous needs of others compared to this longing of mine, crying for deliverance after years of torment—) \textit{to be able to be with you again for a longer period of time.}

Schoenberg's reply is both fatherly reassurance of reconciliation and further admonishment (17-05-15):\textsuperscript{75}

You're angry that I accused you of dreaming! But I would like to make you still angrier. So angry that you jump up and bash me over the skull (of course it needn't be \textit{my} skull, I'm not volunteering)! ...
So please: wake up! I stand by what I said! Today more than ever it's important to be a man. Remember, in a few months you may have to wield a bayonet!

Of course I'd rather do other things, too. But if necessary one must be able to do that sort of thing, too.

*I'm very pleased* that you want to come to Berlin. I'll be very happy to discuss various such matters with you. Then *other things* will clear up quite naturally.

Incidentally you are quite wrong to accuse me of treating you differently since Leipzig. Maybe it's *you* who has changed! You need the kind of work where you'd have to slug it out. You should look for that kind! Look at me: I have never stopped fighting and that's why I'm always wide awake. Of course: for I must always be prepared for the nightly ambush of conspirators.

Berg's open acknowledgment of his trepidation before Schoenberg was followed by confessions of his superstitions concerning his 'fateful' number, "23". Records of Berg's numerological obsession date from the beginning of 1914 and the obsession itself probably arose much earlier. In June of 1915, however, he gave Schoenberg (10-06-15) an elaborate and far-fetched list of coincidences which associate the number with the transfer of funds oversight and other personal and interpersonal events. Schoenberg's cautionary reply (15-06-15) prompted Berg to downplay the negative associations of the number; in the same letter (20-06-15), however, Berg cites supporting data from Wilhelm Fliess's *Vom Leben und Tod*—a work which he says he came upon by chance in the Summer of 1914—which purports to demonstrate 23 and 28 as male and female numbers, respectively, for all living creatures.76 We shall suggest in connection with *Reigen* (Chapter 5) that Berg (bolstered by the 'authority' of Fliess) began regularly to incorporate '23s' into his work beginning at this time—again, part of his personal 'programmatic solution'.

Throughout this period, both Berg and Weber interceded with various officials to lessen Schoenberg's possible military assignment, campaigning in particular to obtain for him the *Einjährig-Freiwilligen-Recht* which would allow him to volunteer for a single year of service in the
regiment of his choice. Berg had been declared “unfit” in a medical examination 27–11–14, which left him despondent when what would have been his call-up time came and went in February of 1915. After the Italians entered the War (23–05–15) Berg was declared “fit” in a follow-up examination (09–06–15) and his call up was rescheduled for 15–07–15.27

When this military call-up was also briefly delayed, Berg seized the opportunity to complete Reigen. He went to Trahütten to work from 12–07–15 to 13–08–15. The beginning of the Reigen Particell bears the date—“13/VII”, the time—“abends 1/2 6 – 1/2 7”, and what appears to be a bit of wartime reportage—“Artilleriesfeuer vo[n] d[er] Kärnter Grenze. (Malborghet?) S.O. Tolmin S.S.O.” Berg reports artillery fire from the Carinthian border south-southeast (“S.S.O.”) of Trahütten in the direction of Tolmin (Slovenia).28 No additional dates are found in either the original autograph score or the fair copy of Reigen.

Berg wrote to Webern the same day (13–07–15):29

I intend to remain here for a couple of weeks. I want once and for all to complete the 3rd of the “three Orchestra Pieces” which I dedicated last year to Schoenberg; i.e., to write out the full score, and then bring it to Vienna nicely copied out for Schoenberg. Then the deadline for my call-up is soon approaching, which I’ll also meet with still greater peace of mind if I’ve finished this Opus 6. Op. 1 is the Sonata, Op. 2 the 4 Songs with piano, Op. 3 the Quartet, Op. 4 the 5 Orchestral Songs ([with texts by] Peter Altenberg), Op. 5 the 4 Clarinet Pieces, Op. 6, finally, the 3 Orchestra Pieces.

Who knows how things will be, if we’ll ever return to work?!!

Similarly, Berg wrote Schoenberg (15–07–15) to say that he would be staying in Trahütten for about two weeks in order to complete the full score of Reigen:80

I am staying here about 14 days and want to complete the 3rd of the ‘Three Orchestra Pieces’ which I worked on last Summer and to write it out for you. I can then join up with still greater peace of mind:
firstly, because I will have completed a work which appears to me important; secondly, because my conscience has not left me in peace since the beginning of the war. For I am concerned—even if I surely know, that you, dear Herr Schoenberg, didn’t mean me when you spoke of the many young people who still wander around in Vienna at this time—I have always felt it so myself, felt it myself in my heart entirely clearly, that it isn’t right, that I haven’t been ‘done with’ [i.e., inducted] thus far.

By 02–08–15 he had apparently completed the task:81

I would ... very much have liked, Herr Schoenberg, to have personally presented you with the missing 2nd of the 3 Orchestra Pieces (dedicated to you last year). Now I have to do it through the post and, in order that you receive both letter and package while still in Vienna: express and registered.

Berg was unable to meet Schoenberg because the family had been accused of being Russian spies and he had to remain in Trahütten to clear matters up! However, a letter to Webern (05–08–15) confirms that the score was sent:82

I found only just enough time [due to the spy affair] to communicate with him [Schoenberg] in a detailed express letter, although I was unable to find out, whether Schoenberg had waited to see me. I just sent him the copy of the recently completed 3rd Orchestra Piece “Reigen.”

Berg’s subsequent military duties exhausted him and resulted in a complete physical breakdown. This was at the beginning of November 1915.83 In final documents from this period, it becomes apparent that Berg’s physical breakdown led him to review once again his relations with Schoenberg. Berg requested a meeting with Schoenberg to clear up their differences.84

Following the meeting, however, Berg still felt it advisable to write out his views of the “situation” in a long letter. After presenting an extraordinarily extended litany of the activities he had undertaken over the past two-and-a-
half years on Schoenberg’s behalf and after lamenting his own limited compositional output during the same period, Berg acknowledges: 

In the end, I, of course, took to heart your criticism of the triviality and worthlessness of my new compositions and your objections to my piano reductions, and applied it in the works that followed: the Orchestra Pieces [Opus 6] and the piano reduction [of Schoenberg’s Chamber Symphony]. In the 3 Orchestra Pieces, I genuinely, strenuously and sincerely attempted to write character pieces in the manner which you had suggested—of standard duration, rich in thematic work, bereft of any striving to be “new” at all costs—and to put my utmost into the work. Perhaps I could have achieved more if I weren’t basically such a slow worker .... .... At any rate, I did what I could.

In a spirited defense of his move out of Vienna to Trahütten, which Schoenberg had apparently regarded as self-interested, the third of Berg’s four enumerated reasons is:

3. I wanted to finish the Orchestra Pieces:
   a.) because they should have been finished long ago
   b.) because I had explicitly promised them to you and
   c.) didn’t know if in consequence of my military duty I would ever have a chance to finish them.

Of Reigen, he says:

I also ... sent you the finally completed score of my 3rd Orchestra Piece, in the hope that that, at least, would be a proof of how I have continually thought of you and have always wished to be at peace with you. On that, too, no answer.

§
Notes to Chapter 2, “ein Entstehungsreigen”:


All translations are a mixture of my own work and consultative borrowings; the German text is supplied in the notes, though it may often be available in one or an amalgam of several published sources.


4For the Schoenberg–Berg–Webern correspondence, letters are be cited in the following abbreviated format: 07-05-11 W-B (i.e., 7th of May 1911, Webern to Berg). In the present case, the letters are 07-05-11 W-B, 03-01-12 S-B, and 14-02-12 S-B.


14-02-12 S-B: “... was ist davon mit Ihren Komponieren? Sie erwähnen nie etwas davon. Sie sollten doch dazu schauen. Vielleicht zunächst wieder einmal ein paar Lieder!! Eventuell Orchester-Lieder!”
The English translation of the selected Berg–Schoenberg correspondence appeared only after this phase of my documentary research was completed. Brand, Hailey, Harris 1987 will likely become standard (see, however, the critical review by Claudio Spies, 1988) and I profited greatly from their work in revising my translations. My archival work was also immensely aided by a working transcription of the three-way correspondence, for access to which I thank Ernst Hilmar (A-Wst).

"29-07-12 B-W; reply to 27-07-12 W-B. The German may be pieced together from Redlich 1957a, 88 and Reich 1963, 37:

"... Dein Brief, lieber Freund, ... hat mich aufs tiefste bewegt! Nämlich die Nachricht von Schönbergs Arbeiten an dem Bühnenwerk nach Seraphita. Das ist kolossal! Mit Musik doch?! Gott! Was uns noch alles beschieden ist!! Wenn ist nur an diese Erzählung denke, wird’s mir ganz warm ums Herz. Nun das erst mit Musik vom Schönberg—an 3 Abenden!!! ..."


Schoenberg’s plans for Seraphita eventually became intertwined with and overtaken by Die Jakobsleiter (see Stuckenschmidt 1977, 175–176, 225, and 234–236). The chronology, which also includes Schoenberg’s setting of Ernest Dowson’s “Seraphita” (Op. 22, no. 1), is given in detail in Maegaard 1972, I:74–76, 80–86, and 91–93.

"If proof be needed that Schoenberg’s plans for Balzac’s Seraphita would necessarily preclude Berg’s own, consider the letter of 03–10–12: Schoenberg, again with prophetic teaching intuition, suggests that Berg consider writing for the theatre—Strindberg is recommended, but Berg is told to stay clear of the Dream Plays because Schoenberg is considering them himself. See Brand, Hailey, Harris 1987, 117.

"The quotations are from the following sources:


Concerning the “melodic remnant [melodischer Rest]”, see Redlich 1957a, 88. Redlich may well have been speaking poetically here—to no end of subsequent confusion.

Perle 1980, 12 and n28 points out that the remnant must be the opening theme, due to the amount of recapitulation of earlier material in the interlude; a neat summary of that recapitulated material is found in Jarman 1979, 196.

It is, in fact, rather remarkable that there is no surviving document concerning Berg's Seraphita plans. Documents exist, for example, for the far-less-publicized ‘opera trilogy’ —Wozzeck, Vincent, Wolfgang (A-Wn F 21 Berg 70/1 and 98)—and for the pre-Lulu plan for a setting of Gerhard Hauptmann's Und Pippa tanzt (A-Wn F 21 Berg 125, 131, and 134). No copy of Balzac's Seraphita is found in A-Wn. The Alban Berg Stiftung (located in Berg's Trauttmansdorffgasse residence) does have a copy of Balzac 1911 (letters). It contains some marginalia in reference to Seraphita (e.g., pp. 15–17 and 210–215); nothing, however, points to plans for a musical work.

In addition to the Ninth, Mahler's Third, Fifth, and Sixth Symphonies were also noticeably influential. Redlich 1957a, 93–101 tabulates some of the thematic affinities, extended by DeVoto 1984, 443 and 445.


There are numerous and detailed letters between Berg and Schoenberg throughout the period under investigation concerning Berg's arrangements of Schoenberg's Opus 10, Gurrelieder, and the Chamber Symphony. The last was never published but is found in the Berg Nachlaß (A-Wn F 21 Berg 91). When all of this work is coupled with the analytical concert guides for Pelleas, Gurrelieder, and the Chamber Symphony—all of which were initially undertaken in this same period—it may perhaps be wondered how Berg accomplished any of his own creative work. Concerning Berg's health at this time, as well as Schoenberg's apparent attitude towards such health problems, see Redlich 1957b, 219–221.

The dating of the individual songs of Opus 4, initially posited in Mark DeVoto's unpublished Ph.D. dissertation (1967, 86–95), is summarized in Jarman 1979, 5–6. The order of composition was likely 4, 3, 5, 2, 1. The date of Berg's letter to Webern is often cited as 05–08[rather than 09]–12 but is obviously a reply to 30–08–12.

Preparatory documents for the concert guide are found in A-Wn F 21 Berg 92 and 93. Concerning a letter from Webern to Berg giving advice on rehearsal techniques, see Moldenhauer 1979, 659n8.

The concert bill is reproduced in Stuckenschmidt 1977, 186. Webern’s pieces were still known as Opus 4 at this time.

The exchange is also found in Stuckenschmidt 1977, 184. Letter from Freund to Schoenberg (10–12–13; Los Angeles, Arnold Schoenberg Institute); letter from Schoenberg to Freund (24–01–13; US-NYpm). These sentences also quoted by R. Hilmar 1978, 94 and 93: “Den Berg—seien Sie nicht böse—kann ich nicht singen—der ist nicht schön ...;” and the reply: “Aber das sollten Sie nicht tun! Weil einem etwas nicht gleich gefällt, legt man es nicht weg!”

Berg 1965: 182 (Berg 1971: 150) later noted that the songs were sung out of context and “rather murdered” by Boruttau—absolute pitch notwithstanding. Upon reflection, the performance of two of the shortest songs from Berg’s cycle courted disaster from the outset, and was a remarkably uncharacteristic concession for Schoenberg’s normally high performance standards. See Perle 1983, 144–145.


The review is quoted in R. Hilmar 1978, 97. Hilmar provides many other documentary details related to the preparations for and reviews of this notorious concert.

Stuckenschmidt 1977, 187. Schoenberg had been given use of the residence of Albertine Zehme, the first Pierrot, Berlin-Südende, Berlinerstrasse 17a. Berg’s convoluted response (15–05–13) to Schoenberg’s request (08–05–13) for the Bergs’ precise accommodation needs is a notable indicator of his excitement (perhaps bordering on consternation) in anticipation of the trip. See Brand, Hailey, Harris 1987, 176–179.

... Daß sich neben diesen schönsten Erinnerungen ungetrübten Genießens auch die des letzten Nachmittags mit seinen, für mich niederrückenden Wahrheiten vordrängt, werden Sie, lieber Herr Schönberg, wohl begreifen. Aber ich muß Ihnen doch ebenso für Ihren Tadel danken wie für alles, was ich von Ihnen erhielt, wohl wissend, daß er gut
gemeint—zu meinem Besten ist. Ich brauch’ Ihnen, lieber Herr Schönberg, auch nicht zu sagen, daß mein großer Schmerz deswegen eine Gewähr dafür ist, daß ich den Tadel beherzige. Und—wird mir dies Vornahme gelungen sein—was ich freilich nur mit ängstlicher Spannung erhoffe (denn mein Zweifel an mir selbst ist immer so gross, daß der geringste Tadel von Ihrer einzig berufenen Seite mir fast alle Hoffnung raubt)—wird mir also meine gute Vornahme gelungen sein, dann wird auch dieser Schmerz seine Bitterkeit verloren haben und gerade er zu jenen Errinnerungen gehören, die—wie allemal, wenn Sie mir mit unerbittlicher Wahrheit in Gewissen redeten—trotz des Niederdrückenden davon, voll tiefer—wenn auch ernster, trauriger Schönheit waren.

"Hoffentlich kann ich Ihnen durch die That bald beweisen, was ich hier in Worten kaum auszudrücken vermochte. Sobald ich aufs Land komme, möchte ich mit der Suite beginnen. Vielleicht gelingt mir doch einmal etwas Heiteres!"

Redlich 1957a, 90. Short excerpts only in Redlich 1957b, 66–67; also Reich 1965, 41–42. A translation of the complete letter is in Brand, Hailey, Harris 1987, 180.

In order to convey the ‘developing variation’ of Berg’s vocabular redundancy in this decidedly awkward letter, I have chosen to translate “Tadel” differently at each occurrence—“censure,” “criticism,” “reproof.” Similarly, I have translated “Vornahme” first as “undertaking,” and later as “resolve.”

21Reich’s assertion (Reich 1965, 41) that it was the aphoristic form of the pieces which cause Schoenberg’s censure can hardly hold. That criticism might better have been levelled against Webern’s pieces, or indeed, against Schoenberg’s own. Rather, Schoenberg’s first reponse to op. 4 voices his principal concern (14–01–13): “Einiges ist mir zunächst nicht angenehm; nämlich, der etwas zu offenkündige Streben neue Mittel anzuwenden.” [“I find some things disturbing at first; namely, the rather too obvious desire to use new means.”]

Precise dates for the Clarinet Pieces, op.5, have not been determined. It is quite possible that Berg, as intended, showed them to Schoenberg during the Berlin visit. Evidence in sketchbook A-Wst MH 14.263/c (as described in Chapter 3), however, suggests that at least the second and third pieces were not completed at that time (June 1913).

und oft daran dachte u. mir die Ausführung derselben vornahm, so kam es
dennoch nicht dazu. Ich sah mich immer wieder gedrängt, einem älteren
Bedürfnis—nämlich eine Symphonie zu schreiben—nachzugeben. Und als
[ich] diesem Bedürfnis eine Concession machte, und die Suite mit einer
Prelüde [sic] beginnen wollte, so wurde, als ich an dem zu arbeiten begann,
wider nur der Anfang dieser Symphonie [daraus]. So arbeitete ich halt jetzt
daran weiter: —es soll eine große einsätzige Symphonie werden, natürlich
mit allen in ihr enthaltenen 4 Sätzen resp. Theilen, mit Durchführungen etc.
so in der Art des Baues der Kammersymphonie. Nebenbei wird aber sicher
der Plan der Suite so weit reifen, daß ich wirklich einmal sicher dazu komme,
sie zu schreiben und so Ihr gütiger Vorschlag—wenn auch später—realisiert
wird. Ich hoffe mit meiner ganzen Kraft, daß Sie mir wegen des
Hinausschiebens der Erfüllung Ihres Vorschlags nicht böß sind. Es ist nicht
als eine Eigenmächtigkeit betrachten! Sie wissen lieber Herr Schönberg selbst,
wie ich mir immer bewußt bin, und mir nie etwas anderes bewußt sein
mochte als: Ihr Schüler zu sein. Ihren also in jeder Hinsicht zu folgen und
tzu wissen daß alles, was ich wider Ihrem Wunsche täte gefehlt ist! Wenn ich
in den letzten Monaten so viel u. stark an die Ausführung einer Symphonie
dachte, so geschah es sicherlich größentheils weil ich das, was ich noch unter
Ihnen, lieber Herr Schönberg, gearbeitet hätte, wenn Sie in Wien geblieben
waren, nachholen wollte, weil ich Ihrem Worte, 'Jeder Ihrer Schüler sollte
auch eine Symphonie geschrieben haben' befolgen sollte [sic].

Ihr—Schüler Berg

Translations in Berg 1984, 6 (partial); Brand, Hailey, Harris 1987, 182.

25Reich 1965, 113 (=Reich 1963, 107). The reference is to the "quickly
marshalled analytical remarks" which Berg sent to Johannes Schüler for the
program book, edited by Dr. Fritz Uhlenbruch, which were prepared for the
Oldenburg premiere (14–04–30). Neither Berg's letters to Schüler nor the
program book have been located. Schüler's request for "einige Worte für
Programmheft" is found in a postscript to his letter to Berg of 01–04–30 (A–
Wn F 21 Berg 133/6), two weeks (rather than four, as Reich has it) before the
premiere.

26Berg's Notizhefte are briefly described in R. Hilmar 1985a (Katalog), 90–92
(item 718). I examined them in June 1987; Mark DeVoto was doing the same
at that time and I am indebted to him for sharing his notes and insights. The
specific sketches mentioned above are located as follows: Nr. 44—fol. 26, 26v–
27, 27v, 28–29 (Präludium [?]); Nr. 49—fol. 53v–54, 15v–16; Nr. 48—fol. 54.

27The Altenbergglieder sketchbook (A–Wn F 21 Berg 65) is briefly described in
R. Hilmar 1980 (Katalog), 39 (item 106). Folio 21 is a separate sheet of
accounting paper which contains the "Widmung Bergs an Schönberg"
(actually a testimonial about his tutelage under Schoenberg) to which the
catalogue refers. Folio 20v is the last page of the sketchbook before the back cover. The sketchbook is discussed in detail in Chapter 3, pp. 118-123 and pp. 129-132.

13–08–13 S–B: “Was macht Ihre Symphonie? Sie erwähnen sie mit keinem Wort mehr.”


Both items are also quoted in the “Introduction” to Berg 1984. Additional brief references to the symphony: 19–07–13 B–S and 24–07–13 W–B; in the former, Berg seems a bit concerned that Schoenberg has not mentioned receipt of the letter of 09–07–13 where he first broached the change of plans, from suite to symphony. A later letter (03–10–14) indicates that Berg hoped to continue work on the symphony in Vienna (that letter translated in Brand, Hailey, Harris 1987, 190).


The transcription in the published facsimile is in error: the F3 on the last eighth of m.4 should read G3; the lowest note of the four-note chord on the same beat is not F-sharp but F-natural.

Berg 1984, 2: “eine frühe Skizze (in Tinte) zum Orchesterstück op. 6 Nr. 1.” The English translation (p. 7) somewhat concatenates the remainder of the German description.

The idea is, quite clearly, the flute melody of measures 19–21; the eighth-note pair at the beginning of measure 21 is written as a dotted eighth and sixteenth on folio 6v.

The description of the contents in the facsimile edition erroneously states that folio 12v has an unidentifiable musical notation. The page is in fact blank.

Berg’s copy of the Schoenberg’s op.16 in Webern’s two-piano reduction is preserved in the Nachlaß (A–Wn 21 Berg 155). A separate sheet of
manuscript contains Berg’s analytical notes on op. 16, no. 3. In Chapter 4, I make the case that Schoenberg’s piece served Berg as a model for the Präludium. Berg’s letter to Schoenberg (10–09–13) is also quoted there.

3503-10-13 B–S: "... wieder zur Arbeit—zur Fortsetzung meiner Symphonie zu gelangen ...." This letter is translated in Brand, Hailey, Harris 1987, 190.


38Berg 1965: 172 (Berg 1971: 141). Concerning the Amsterdam performance of Opus 16 see Op de Coul 1982, 146–151; also shown in facsimile on page 174 of the same journal issue is Mengelberg’s copy of the first page of the score of op. 16, no. 3 with the subtitle “Der wechselnde Akkord”—which puts the emphasis on the motivically-generated changing of the referential chord rather than on its purely ‘colourisitic’ qualities. (The subtitle originally considered was “Akkordfärbungen”; that finally selected was, of course, “Farben”.) The relation between motive and chord is apparently what fascinated Berg and, as I suggest in Chapter 4, is what shows the influence of op. 16, no. 3 on the Präludium.

39See R. Hilmar 1978, 111–112. We are only aware of the nature of Schoenberg’s critique from Berg’s somewhat later correspondence: his acceptance of Schoenberg’s compositional advice (26–03–14); his resolve to change his living habits (08–06–14); his fear, since the Leipzig-Amsterdam trip, of engendering Schoenberg’s censure (06–05–15); and his final summation (late 11–15). Berg’s handwriting really is bad! Schoenberg criticizes it, as well as Berg’s rambling, overly formal style (28–11–13, for example). Berg’s apologies are frequent (10–09–13, 03–12–13, 26–03–14, 28–03–14, 08–06–14, and late 11–15). These letters are now available in Brand, Hailey, Harris 1987.

4010–04–14 B–S: “Nun bin ich seit drei Tagen endlich zum Arbeiten gekommen, Anlage und viele Theile eines größeren Satzes, der einen Marsch vorstellen soll, sind fertig; leider ist meine Frau wieder leidend, Ihre immer mehr zunehmenden Neur- und Gichtschmerzen erzeugten starkes, langanhaltendes Fieber, das noch nicht ganz geschunden ist. Auch bei mir hat sich mit dem Frühling das Asthma eingestellt. Also genug Vorbedingungen, seh’n Sie, zuletzt etwas Heiters zu schreiben. Vielleicht wird es um einmal verkehrt!: Wenn das, was ich schreibe, nicht das ist, was ich erlebt habe, richtet sich vielleicht mein Leben einmal nach meinen Kompositionen, die ja dann die reinsten Prophezeiungen wären. Aber ich glaube diese Kraft fehlt mir wie wo viele andere und wenn ich auch auf äußerste bestrebt bin einmal “die Thräänen” zu vermeiden, so wird’s
vielleicht doch kein Marsch eines aufrechten Menschen, der fröhlich marschiert, sondern im besten Fall—and dann wäre es wenigstens ein 'Characterstück'—eine 'Marsch eines Asthmatikers,' der ich bin und, mir scheint, ewig bleibe."

Berg’s ironically rueful reference to his (in)ability to write “something cheerful [etwas Heiteres]” resurfaces three months later in his description of Reigen to Helene Berg (13-07-14) as: “a very tender, also cheerful, piece of dancelike character.” It will be shown in Chapter 5, that aspects of Berg’s personal condition formed the inspirational basis for the second ‘character piece’ of Opus 6 as well.

On the asthmatic qualities of the captain, see Petersen 1985, 56–57. On the generally autobiographical aspects of Wozzeck see Blaukopf 1954.


28-05-14 S-B: "Ich bin darüber sehr ärgerlich, denn ich sehe, wie wenig ernst Sie diese Angelegenheit nehmen. ... Jedenfalls aber weiß ich jetzt, dass ich mich auf Sie nicht verlassen darf." Berg and Webern, with the support of Alma Mahler, worked incessantly to alleviate Schoenberg’s difficult financial position throughout this period. See the summary in R. Hilmar 1978, 99–107.

08-06-14 B-S: "... ich habe mir in diesen Tagen, wenn ich nicht gerade die Arbeit aus einer mir wie im Schlafwandel gewordenen Erleuchtung riß, dreht ein Programm eines Lenbensführung gemacht, nach welchem alle von mir bisher teils ungeahnten, teils unentrinnbaren Mängel behoben werden sollen." And: "ob direkt oder über Webern oder Stein, wenn Sie denen gerade schreiben, —ein Wort zu kommen zu lassen, an das ich mich in dieser Hilflosigkeit klammern kann, das mir wieder ein wenig Mut und die Möglichkeit zu hoffen gibt . . . . . ." Berg later cited the date of his late bank arrival as another instance of the fateful number ‘23’ (10-06-15 B–S).


Tage die Kraft, es auch so niederzuschreiben, wie es mir vorschwebt. Das ist nämlich noch ein weiter Weg. Fast geradeso weit wie der Weg vom Erlebnis bis dorthin, wo es musikalische Gestalt annimmt. Und wie viele Erlebnisse nehmen die nie an, und wie oft leider bleibt’s wieder nur bei der leblosen Gestalt, der nie das Leben eingehaucht wird!”


Berg 1965: 182: “Wie gern schrieb ich das Klavierstücke1 für Dich fertig. Ich habe sogar die letzte Zeit daran gedacht. Aber es will nicht werden. D.h. ich hätte natürlich die Fähigkeit, an diese paar Takte, die eigentlich nur Anfang sind, eine Art Fortsetzung und Schluß anzuheften, aber das wäre eine Schularbeit, die nicht einmal Dir gefiel. Ich könnte in dieser Arbeit nicht das geben, was ich geben möchte: das Beste. — Vielleicht, weil der Einfall selbst nicht einmal so originell ist, eher nachempfunden in Stimmung und Ton (wenn ich auch kein Vorbild dafür wüßte), während ich bei den anderen Arbeiten, die fertig geworden sind, (selbst in vielen älteren Liedern) immer das Beste gab, was ich jeweils geben konnte, und die auch heute noch gelten lassenden, mir nicht nachempfunden erscheinen, sondern mich ganz ausdrückenden Opusse 1 bis 5—Sonate, 4 Lieder, Quartett, “Ansichtskartentexte” und Klarinettstücke—mit ruhigem Gewissen, Dir, Pferscherl, widmen könnte. Und wenn ich auch die neuen Orchesterstücke Schönberg widmen werde, dem ich als meinem Lehrer längst die Widmung eines größeren Werkes schuldig bin und der sich diese Stücke heuer in Amsterdam direkt zu seinem 40. Geburtstag gewünscht, ja bestellt hat und deren Anregung, sowohl durch das Anhören seiner Orchesterstücke (aber nicht—wohlgermekrt—nachempfunden denselben; sie werden sogar grundverschieden davon!) als durch den ermahnen Rat: Charakterstücke zu schreiben, auch ihm zu verdanken ist. Wenn ich also diese 3 Stücke nicht
offiziell dem Pferscher widmen werde, so steckt doch in allen dreien ein gut Stück Pferscher drin, und wenn der auch nicht gleich Gefallen dran finden sollte, so weiß ich, daß er sie einmal doch so lieben wird wie mich, samt meinen Fehlern und vielleicht mehr als Dein Stücke!, wenn ich's auch fertig bring'.

Berg 1971, p. 158n3.

Composer 'drops his mask': Berg referred to the final interlude as “the composer's confession, breaking through the framework of the dramatic plot (Redlich 1957b, 284).” Joseph Kerman (1956, 231-233) has likened this to “an Aristotelian catharsis” where the actors drop their masks and appeal directly to the audience.


Berg 1965: 186: “Eben jetzt Dein lieb’s Briefe! bekomen. Gestern am Heimweg von der Stadt fiel mir plötzlich das ein, was ich den ganzen Vormittag am Klavier nicht recht finden konnte: Vielleicht hat mein Pferscherl indessen darum gebetet! [...] Ich glaub’ schon, daß das Beten was nützt! Heut’ früh hatt’ ich schon mit Erfolg am anderen Stück geschrieben. Und jetzt geh’ ich wieder an die unterbrochenen Arbeit. Nachmittag werde ich wahrscheinlich nach der Stunde zuhaus bleiben.”


28–07–14 B–S: "Das wird also Ende Juli seien, bis wohin ich — mit mehr Ruhe als gewöhnlich — meine Orchesterstucke bis auf die Reinschrift fertig bringen will."


5905–08–14 W–B: "Also Deine Arbeit ist fast fertig. Ich bin schon sehr neugierig."
18-08-14 S-B: "Lieber Berg, was ist mit Ihnen? Warum höre ich nichts von Ihnen? Haben Sie alles Interesse für mich verloren?" The letter Berg says he wrote 11-08-14 is not known to me.

24-08-14 B-S: "Ich muß meine ganze Kraft zusammen nehmen, um ruhig bei der Arbeit zu bleiben. Etwas ist die ohnehin durch die Unruhe im Allgemeinen und meine besondere beeinträchtigt worden."

The fair copy is part of the Mary Flagler Cary collection. The autograph is part of the Robert Lehman collection. The Lehman collection also contains a correction copy (Korrekturexemplar) of Opus 6. Robert Lehman purchased the scores sometime in the mid 1970s. J. Rigbie Turner, Curator of Music for the Pierpont Morgan Library [US-NYpm], says that Mr. Lehman did not keep careful records of the provenance of his collection. The scores were purchased, via an agent, from Universal Edition. Presumably U.E. parted with the scores because they no longer served as the basis for edition. It has unfortunately not been possible to confirm this history. The place of these scores in the publication history of Opus 6 is recounted in Chapter 6.


03-09-14 W-B: "Er [Schönberg] dachte jedenfalls, Du seiest schon einberufen, da er nichts hörte von Dir. Du siehst, was ich Dir sagte, ist längst eingetroffen. Schönberg war Dir überhaupt nie böse. Das ist so wie bei einem Vater. Ich muß in den Krieg. Ich muß. Ich halte es nicht mehr aus!"


"Ich kann heute nicht sagen, ob es mir gelang, oder ob es nur ein Versuch blieb. Sollte letzteres der Fall sein, so müssen Sie, lieber Herr Schönberg, in Ihrer mir immer erwiesenen väterlichen Güte, den guten Willen für die Tat nehmen. Ich habe mich wirklich bemüht, mein Bestes zu


"Empfangen Sie, lieber Herr Schönberg, meine aller allerherzlichsten Wünsche zu Ihrem Geburtstag und seien Sie und Ihre verehrte Frau Gemahlin und die lieben Kinder vielmals gerügt von Ihrem Berg"

Redlich 1957a, 91–92 quotes this letter in full. His notes [360 n117 and n119] are in need of correction. The Amsterdam rehearsals for the premiere of Schoenberg’s op. 16 took place prior to the performance of 12–03–12 (rather than ‘Ende 1912’); Berg’s piano arrangement of the Chamber Symphony, as has been mentioned above (note 58), is now known to be extant in A–Wn F 21 Berg 91. Translation of the letter also in Brand, Hailey, Harris, 1987 214–215.

"20–09–14 S–B: "Lieber Berg, ich danke Ihnen sehr für Ihre Geburtstagswünsche und für die Partitur.

"Lieber Ihr Werk kann ich Ihnen aber leider vorläufig nichts sagen. Ich habe zwar schon öfters hineingesehen, aber Sie werden ja selbst wissen, wie schwer es ist, sich aus so komplizierten Noten ein Bild zu machen und Sie werden begreifen, das mir in dieser Zeit auch die Ruhe fehlt.

"Ich nehme also mit Vertrauen an, dass die Absicht so stark war, wie der Wille und danke Ihrem für die Tat. —

[The remainder of the letter reads as follows:]

"Herzlichste Grüße Schön[er]g"

**28–09–14 B–S:** "Ich bin froh, daß ich Sie, mit der Sendung der Partitur nicht gestört habe; ich weiß ja selbst gut, daß man heute lieber Landkarten als Partituren anschaut, und, um sich mit Musik zu beschäftigen (oder überhaupt mit etwas, was nicht den Krieg betrifft), die größte Überwindung gehört. ... Diese Ungewissheit ist eben so schrecklich und quälend als die Ereignisse selbst. Dass ich unter solchen Bedingungen mir nicht vorstellen kann, wie ich in den nächsten Zeit arbeiten soll, werden Sie, lieber Herr Schönberg, gewiss begreifen. Ja es kommt mir manchmal direkt frevelhaft vor, an anderes zu denken als an den Krieg. Wenn ich es trotzdem bis jetzt über Herz brachte—zuerst mein Ihnen gesandte Partitur fertig zustellen [sic], dann am Kammerorchestereingabe Klavierauszug weiter zu arbeiten, und die Absicht habe ich nicht eher zu wohn bis ich fertig habe, so geschah und geschieht das aus den, durch Ihre Ermahnungen im Frühjahr in mir angesammelten höchsten Willen und Entschluß, die mir vorgesetzte Arbeit unter allen Umständen zu leisten, und mich von nichts in der Ausführung dieses Entschlusses, hindern zu lassen."

**70**For a summary of Berg’s wartime activities, see R. Hilmar 1976, 113–130; also Moldenhauer 1978, 209–226. Berg was declared “unfit” in an examination on 27–11–14, something which left him despondent, though not completely insensitive to the horrible realities which he might have faced had he been declared fit (see 14–12–14 B–S, for example).

**71**Concerning Berg’s greater understanding of Schoenberg’s works, see 08–10–14; we can, of course, assume that Berg acquainted himself with all of Schoenberg’s works as soon as they became available—of the newer works, however, he specifically mentions studying *Die glückliche Hand* and, from Opus 22, Dowson’s “Seraphita” [for both, see 26–03–14 and 08–10–14] and Rilke’s “Alle welche dich suchten” [though not until 27–05–14]). On the Chamber Symphony arrangement, see also notes 58 and 76 above; in letters to Schoenberg, Berg states his determination to complete the assignment [26–09–14], discusses details of the work 08–10–14, and finished the task by 27–01–15. Proofreading of *Erwartung* was undertaken around 04–02–15 and was completed with Erwin Stein 21–05–15.

**72**Reigen, transition into waltz tempo, m. 20 and m. 94; and transition into Coda, m.. 101–110. Concerning this exchange see R. Hilmar 1978, 115 and n22. Both letters are, in fact, dated 1914—but probably date from 1915 on the basis of cross-references in their contents; see Brand, Hailey, Harris 1987, 226 (06–01–14[15] B–S) and 228 (01–02–14[15] S–B).

06–05–15 B–S: “mein continuierliches Schweigen keineswegs, daß ich nicht zuhöre, wenn Sie, Herr Schönberg, reden, zu dem Gesagten keine Stellung nehme, nicht ebenso begeistert bin, wenn sich das einmal meine Meinung mit der Ihren deckt, oder das anderemal nicht ebenso freudig meine als falsch erkannte Meinung corrigiere, und nicht ebenso temperamentvoll die vielen tausend neuen Eindrücke die mir durch Ihre Gespräche mit anderen wurden, aufnahme, als die „Wachen“, die ihre Begeisterung Zustimmung u[nd] ihr Temperament zeigen. Mein Schweigen kommt vielmehr da[ber], daß ich seit Leipzig–Amsterdam in der Angst lebe, Sie, Herr Schönberg, selbst durch die bescheidenste Bemerkung zu ärgern, Ihren durch eine Betonung meiner Anwesenheit unangenehm zu werden, und weil ich in dieser an’s krankhafte grenzenden Befangenheit auch tatsächlich, in dem Augenblick wo ich etwas sagen möchte, wie vor dem Kopf geschlagen wende und dann den undeutlichen, verträumten—ja blöden Eindruck mache, der mit Recht Ihres Ärgern erregt. Darum wünsche ich ja so, wie sich’s ein anderer gar nicht wünschen kam—denn was ist das freudigste Bedürfnis der anderen gegen meine, nach Erlösung aus jahrelangen Qual, schreienden Sehnsucht—einen länger mit Ihnen beisammen sein zu können;”

17–05–15 S–B: “Sie sind bös, weil ich Ihnen geschrieben habe, Sie hätten geträumt! Aber ich möchte Sie gerne noch viel böser machen. So bös, dass Sie einmal aufspringen und mir (es kann aber auch ein anderer sein, ich reiss mich nicht darum) um dem Schädel hauen! ...

Also bitte: wachen Sie auf! Ich bleibe dabei! Heute ist es nötiger als je, ein Mann zu sein. Bedenken Sie, dass Sie vielleicht in ein paar Monaten ein Bajonett werden führen müssen!

Ich tue ja auch lieber was andres. Aber wenn nötig ist, muss man auch das können.


Concerning Berg’s obsession with ‘23’: the first reference is the letter to Helene 27/28-01-14 [Berg 1965: 170 (Berg 1971: 139 and n3)]; then the cited correspondence 10-06-15 B-S, 15-06-15 S-B, and 20-06-15 B-S [all now in Brand, Hailey, Harris 1987 244-250]. For an early article on Berg’s number fetish, see Pernye 1967. The relevant Fliess writings are Fliess 1909 and Fliess 1913. The relationship of 23 and Fliess to Reigen is discussed in Chapter 1.


*Berg seems unsure himself of the south-easterly “Malborghet?”. However, a month later, in a letter to Helene [13-08-15, Berg 1965: 206 (Berg 1971: 167a)], Berg refers to the brother of an acquaintance who was under fire from the Italians at Fort Nensel near Malborget. Austrian forces successfully repelled several Italian attacks across the Isonzo river below Tolmin at Görz (Gorizia) during this period. Webern had been stationed in Görz between February and May (see Moldenhauer 1978, 212).


Wie wird das sein, wenn wir wieder zur Arbeit kommen?!!”

Berg does not mention the composition in his previous letter, 27-07-15. This letter (02-08-15 B-S) survives only in draft (A-Wn F 21 Berg 480 401-402); it is not known whether Schoenberg received it. Translation in Brand, Hailey, Harris 1987, 253–254.

On the spy scandal, see 02–08–15 B–S, as well as this letter 05–08–15 B–W: “Ich fand nur gerade so viel Zeit, ihm das in einem Expressbrief ausführlich mit zuteilen—obwohl ich aus nichts entnehmen konnte, ob Schönberg überhaupt erwartet hat, mich zu sehen. Ich sandte ihm zugleich die Abschrift des hier unlängst vollendeten 3. Orchesterstück ‘Reigen.’”


Berg’s request for a meeting survives only in a draft copy (A–Wn F 21 Berg 480/404). However, Schoenberg’s granting of the meeting in his reply (20–11–15) makes it clear that some form of communication had been received. By this time, Berg’s ostracizing by Schoenberg had extended to Webern and Stein as well. Webern and Berg were not reconciled until the Fall of 1916; Webers and Berg had his own falling out with Schoenberg between September and November of 1918 (see Moldenhauer 1978, 219, and 224–226).

The letter is extensive; it is complete in Brand, Hailey, Harris 1987, 256–262.

First excerpt: “Schließlich beherzte ich natürlich die Kritik, die Sie an der Geringfügigkeit und Wertlosigkeit meiner damals neuen Kompositionen übten und das, was Sie an meinen Auszügen tadelten, in den nun folgenden Arbeiten: den Orchesterstücken der Kammersymphonie.

“Die 3 Orchesterstücke entsprangen wirklich dem angestrengtesten und zeiligesten Bemühn in der von Ihnen gewünschten Form Charakter Stücke zu schreiben, von normaler Länge, reicher thematischer Arbeit, ohne jeder Sucht unbedingt was ‘Neues’ zu bringen, und in dieser Arbeit mein Bestes zu geben. Wäre ich nicht überhaupt ein langsamer Arbeiter ... so hätte ich ja vielleicht mehr zustande gebracht. ... Jedenfalls habe ich damit getan, was ich tun konnte.”

Second excerpt: “3. wollte ich die Orchesterstücke fertig machen u.z.w. “a.) weil sie schon hätten fertig sein sollen
“b.) weil ich sie Ihnen ja direkt versprochen hatte und ich
“c.) nicht wußten, ob ich infolge meiner Militärdienst—leistung je dazu kommen würde sie zu vollenden.”

Third excerpt: “... ich ... sandte Ihnen zugleich die fertiggestellte Partitur meines 3. Orchesterstückes, im Glauben, das Ihnen die wenigstens ein Beweis wäre, wie ich an Sie in diesen Wochen kontinuierlich dachte und
immer wünschte Sie damit zufrieden zu stellen. Auch darauf keine Antwort."
3 A March through the Documents

Figures 3.1 through 3.3 (on the next three pages) provide an overview of the musical documents related to Opus 6. The Figures are chronologically arranged: from sketches (1912) through autograph score (1914–15), to revised score (1929), to current editions (1954, etc.). Each Figure lists the location of the documents and gives a brief description of contents with my assessment of the dates. More detailed description of the physical make-up and contents of selected items follows. Most of the Berg Nachlaß is located in the music collection of the Austrian National Library in Vienna: these Nationalbibliothek (A-Wn) holdings are designated “F[onds] 21 Berg”; a further call number identifies the individual items or collections of items. Helene Berg gave other material to the City Library: the Wiener Stadt- und Landesbibliothek (A-Wst). Berg’s autograph scores—his first copy and his dedicatory fair copy for Schoenberg—are now located in the Pierpont Morgan Library in New York (US-NYpm).
**Figure 3.1: Overview of Musical Documents Related to Opus 6 from sketches through autograph score...**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location siglum &amp; call no.</th>
<th>Brief Description of Contents</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A-Wn F 21 Berg 65 (probably goes with A-Wst sketchbook)</td>
<td>sketchbook, 20 leaves: counterpoint exercises; op.4, mostly nos. 1, and 2, bits of nos. 3, 4, 5 (e.g., mm.10-12); M m.4(rhythms) fol.20v, and formal notes for a four-in-one movement on back cover</td>
<td>March thru July 1912; Opus 6 item: circa 29-07 or 05-09-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-Wn F 21 Berg 53</td>
<td>sheaf, varying formats; NB 3 leaves: Passacaglia-Fragment sketches, fol.7v–9r [facsimile edition Berg 1984]</td>
<td>probably prior to 30-08-1912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-Wst MH 14.265/c (probably goes with A-Wn F 21 Berg 65)</td>
<td>sketchbook, 25 leaves: counterpoint exercises; op.5, nos. 2, 3; P mm.4–19, 24, 39–41, plus formal notes; R&amp;P chords; R “eventuell Walzer”; M rhythmic references to mm.91, 102, 107</td>
<td>as Berg 65 above; then thru July 1913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-Wn F 21 Berg 53</td>
<td>sheaf, varying formats; NB 3 leaves: Symphonie-Fragment sketch and draft, fol. 10r, and 11–12r [facsimile edition Berg 1984]</td>
<td>between 08-1912 and 08-1913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-Wn F 21 Berg 13/ii</td>
<td>sketchbook, 48 manuscript leaves: M mm.4–15, rhythm (some pitch) for most passages mm.1–90, rhythms mm.136, 149; R “Walzer” p.47–48 is A-Wst page glued in; earliest Wozzeck sketches in second half: ref. to “Polka” (III/3), ideas for II/2, and I/2</td>
<td>M early 1914 Wozzeck sketches after 05-05–1914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-Bspk, N.mus.ms. 70 ‘Wozzeck’</td>
<td>1 leaf: 40 x 29 cm, 20-line wide and narrow rastral; transfer of contents of 13/ii p.5</td>
<td>1914?; letter verso 1931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-Wn F 21 Berg 12</td>
<td>Opus 6 Particell, 33 leaves, 6 formats bound P: fol.1–5, no date; probably done by R: fol.6–17, date at top “13/VII” M: fol.18–33, date at end “14/VII” This is an outstanding musical document.</td>
<td>18-07-1914 13-07-1915 14-07-1914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US-NYpm Lehman coll.</td>
<td>Opus 6 Autograph score, first copy, 51 leaves, 7 formats bound P: 9 leaves, no date; probably done by R: 16 leaves, no date; probably done by M: 26 leaves, date at end of score: “Trahütten 23./VIII.14” (though R 1915)</td>
<td>02-08-1914 02-08-1915 23-08-1914</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Figure 3.2: Overview of Musical Documents Related to Opus 6 [continued] from autograph fair copy through the first edition...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A-Wn F 21 Berg 53</td>
<td>sheaf, varying formats; NB 1 leaf: fol.6v P flute, mm.19–21, in ink; this is a pen trial for the fair copy not a sketch (cf. Berg 1984)</td>
<td>08–1914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US-NYpm Cary coll.</td>
<td>Opus 6 Autograph score, fair copy, dedication copy for Schoenberg, 52 leaves, 8 formats, bound P (9 leaves) and M (26 leaves) sent R (16 leaves) sent</td>
<td>08-09-1914 05-08-1915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-Wn F 21 Berg 69</td>
<td>sheaf, varying formats; NB 4 leaves: cover wrappers (fol.4v; and 7–8) implying a complete 2-piano, 8-hand arrangement; sketches for R mm.1–7, 8–12 (fol.6–6v), and M mm.143–149 (fol.7r)</td>
<td>performance opportunity first known 08–03–1919; done earlier?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not seen; in private collection (cf. A-Wn S.m. 34.206/1, below)</td>
<td>2-piano, 8-hand arrangement, complete; used for Verein performance of <em>Reigen</em> by Steuermann, Novakovíc, Dische, Bachrich</td>
<td>performed 06–06–1919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-Wn F 21 Berg 74/xiv</td>
<td>sheaf, varying formats; NB 1 bifolio: fol.11 top half has page set up for projected Verein chamber ensemble arrangement; never done, cf. letter to Schoenberg:</td>
<td>Verein arr. idea from 17–12–1919; 24–12–22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>whereabouts unknown</td>
<td>parts for Berlin performance of P and R under Webern; probably corrected versions of earlier parts by Berg and Kassowitz</td>
<td>performed 05–06–1923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1923 Edition [exemplar from Newberry Library in Chicago]</td>
<td>1923 edition, Universal Edition [U.E. 7396]: title page, instrument list verso, score pp.3–95, note on last page concerning its reproduction from Schoenberg’s copy; beautiful holograph incorporates changes to fair copy from Berg 142 proofs</td>
<td>06–06–1923 60 copies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vienna, offices of U.E.; with copies at Alban Berg Stiftung</td>
<td>autograph list of required number of parts (72) and players (102) for first edition; with six ms. pages listing errors in the score also to be checked in the parts; dated:</td>
<td>02–08–1925</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Figure 3.3 Overview of Musical Documents Related to Opus 6 [concluded]
from revised score to current edition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Date/Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A-Wn F 21 Berg 141</td>
<td>Revised Score: bound (like Berg 12), copy of 1923 edition of score with thousands of autograph clarifications and revisions including replacements of D clarinet, low B-flat trumpets, and alto trombone, and change to two harps; though later compilations of corrections received Berg’s approval this document is the <em>Fassung letzter Hand</em>; Berg assisted by Otto Jokl</td>
<td>bulk of revisions from 05-03-1929 to 07-05-1929 but cont’d thru 21-08-1929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-Wn S.m. 34.206/1</td>
<td>“copy” by Willi Reich of the 2-piano, 8-hand arr.: 42 leaves; based on 1923 edition (not Berg 141); but many erasures, corrections, comments by Berg; perhaps for lessons in preparation for Oldenburg?</td>
<td>unknown?: Reich took lessons from 11-1928 ...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US-NYpm Cary collection</td>
<td>correction copy: like Berg 141 based on 1923 edition, not as comprehensive; footnote on use of “Jazz mutes;” conductor’s marks; likely one of Jokl’s copies, used by whom?</td>
<td>from mid-1929 on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954 revised edition of full score and parts</td>
<td>1954 edition, Universal Edition [U.E. 7396]: title page, instrumentation instructions verso, score pp.1-107, last page blank; normally only as rental material</td>
<td>prepared as basis for issue of study score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UE-Archiv at A-Wst</td>
<td>corrections copies of full and pocket scores with memoranda concerning their preparation and list of corrections checked against the offset films from Waldheim</td>
<td>from 10-1958 to 28-10-1963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philharmonia pocket score</td>
<td>Philharmonic pocket score [Ph.432]: initial run:</td>
<td>31-01-1974 994 copies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 3.1 lists the sketch sources for Opus 6: A-Wn F 21 Berg 65 contains one sketch for Opus 6 amidst sketches for the Opus 4 Altenberglieder; A-Wst MH 14.263/c contains sketches for two of the Opus 5 Clarinet Pieces and for all three pieces of Opus 6 (though mostly for the Präludium); and A-Wn F 21 Berg 13/ii, contains sketches for the Marsch (principally for its first half), though the second half of the book was cordoned off for the earliest Wozzeck sketches. Figure 3.1 also tabulates the abandoned orchestral projects that overlap the early stages of Opus 6: the Passacaglia-Fragment and the Symphonie-Fragment. These items have been published as Symphonie-Fragmente (Berg 1984). (Discussion of their relation to Opus 6 was undertaken in Chapter 2, above.) The other main source listed in the Figure 3.1 is Berg's Particell (short score), an outstanding musical document that offers copious information on the compositional process and verifies numerous text-critical details; the Particell also clarifies textural relations in dense passages and suggests many analytical points of entry.

Figure 3.2 lists the documents from the time of the autograph score and fair copy (1914–15) through the 1923 edition. The pen trial on folio 6v of Berg 53 is erroneously identified as an early sketch in the introduction to the facsimile edition of the Symphonie-Fragment (Berg 1984, p.2; trans., p.7). The autograph fair copy (US-NYpm, Cary Collection) remains a beautiful document, though the correction proofs (Berg 142) which began from a photoreproduction of that fair copy change a myriad of its musical details. The 1923 edition (U.E. [plate number] 7396; 06–06–1923) is a photographic
reproduction of Berg's **considerably revised** autograph fair copy. The initial print run of the 1923 edition was 60 copies. Webern premiered only the first two pieces in Berlin (05–06–1923) because he was unable to rehearse the *Marsch* adequately.

The other documents listed in Figure 3.2 concern the early performance history in arrangement: Berg 69 relates to the two-piano, eight-hand arrangement, Berg 74/xiv to a projected Verein chamber ensemble arrangement that never materialized (as Berg's letter to Schoenberg of 24–12–1922 confirms). (Evidence for both these arrangements is also found on the first pages of the *Marsch* Particell; a facsimile is provided in Chapter 7.) The date column entries for these items give the date Berg first became aware of the performance possibility. The piano arrangement, however, was likely completed well before Webern's letter to Berg (08–03–1919) that informs him the Verein will perform *Reigen*; for it is unlikely the performance would have been scheduled without an available score. Furthermore, we now know that Berg arranged all three pieces, a task he would unlikely have undertaken for a performance of *Reigen* alone. The autograph score of the two-piano, eight-hand arrangement is now in private hands and was unfortunately not seen. There would of course have to have been at least two copies of the arrangement for the performance of *Reigen*.

Berg's correspondence with Gottfried Kassowitz indicates that they prepared orchestral parts in 1919–1920. The correction proofs (Berg 142; assisted by F.H. Klein) for the 1923 edition show that the "touch ups" of the
fair copy became a more extensive undertaking than Berg anticipated (cf. his letter to Helene, 16–04–1923). Even after the 1923 edition, Berg continued to revise the score in the hopes of a complete orchestral performance: an autograph errata list dated 02–08–1925 (now in the offices of Universal Edition) runs to six pages.

Figure 3.3 documents the continuation of this process with the “revised score” (Berg 141). This document, described as “apparently a correction copy of Berg’s” (R. Hilmar 1980, 52), is actually the Fassung letzter Hand. It incorporates all the changes of instrumentation, corrections and clarifications of detail, and instructions for the copyist that Berg made directly himself. Later correction copies (undertaken with the assistance of Otto Jokl and, perhaps, Julius Schloß as well) were ostensibly done with Berg’s approval—and might well have been executed with more meticulous attention to editorial detail than Berg himself would have mustered—but Berg 141 appears to be his last autograph revision. This revision process probably got under way shortly after Berg decided to entrust the first complete performance of Opus 6 to Johannes Schüler after Schüler’s highly successful regional production of Wozzeck in March of 1929 (using Erwin Stein’s reduced orchestration, Oldenburg, 05–03–1929; cf. Reich 1965, 39). A letter to Schoenberg in May (07–05–1929) speaks of the revision as if it were completed, but Berg’s correspondence with Otto Jokl indicates that they were still working on the revisions through July and August (Nachlaß correspondence items 901[Jokl]/12 (15–07–1929), 14 (30–07–1929), and 16 (21–
08–1929)). And we can assume that further revisions continued up until the
time of Schüler's performance, 14–04–1930.

An odd document from around this time is A-Wn S.m. 34.206/1. It is a
complete, but manifestly inaccurate, "copy" [Abschrift] by Willi Reich of a
piano reduction for all three pieces (presumably some form of the two-piano,
eight-hand arrangement). The document is possibly the product of Reich's
lessons with Berg; perhaps it represents an assignment in score study
undertaken in preparation for the Oldenburg performance. (Reich has,
conveniently, boxed Berg's annotations in blue pencil.)

The remainder of Figure 3.3 tabulates those documents which concern
the posthumous publication history of the Opus 6 pieces, Universal Edition's
1954 publication of the study score and the 1974 appearance of the score in the
Philharmonia series. The compilation correction copy now in the offices of
Universal Edition which served as the basis [Vorlage] for these editions has
several annotations concerning the editorial team which included Julius
Schloß (probably in 1929), Erwin Stein (1936), and Hans Erich Apostel (1953).
Further details concerning the performance and publication history of Opus 6
may be found in Chapter 6. For now, we turn to a more detailed description
of the physical structure and contents of those documents listed in Fig.3.1 that
are most central to our study of Berg's compositional process in Opus 6: the
sketchbooks and the Particell.

Though Berg 65 mainly concerns the Altenberglieder, the compelling presence in this source of one sketch for the Opus 6 Marsch, as well as the physical placement of that sketch within the document, demands that we examine the item in some detail. Berg 65 and MH 14.263/c are loosely gathered sketchbook leaves that probably once constituted a single bound sketchbook. The first is now in the Nationalbibliothek, the second is in the Stadtbibliothek. The latter, which will be described shortly, contains sketches for all three Opus 6 pieces, particularly for the Präludium. The Stadtbibliothek sketchbook would be the earliest musical source for Opus 6 were it not for the awkward intrusion of Berg 65 into the documentary narrative. The paper type for both items is oblong octavo in format, 17 x 12.4 cm. The rastral information is: 10-line manuscript, total span 9.8 cm, single span 0.5 cm, total length 15.4 cm. ('Total span' is the distance between the top of the top staff and the bottom of the bottom staff; 'single span' is the distance between the top line and bottom line of one staff; 'total length' refers to the left-right length of the staff lines. This rastral information is similar to that normally taken for eighteenth-century documents. See for example Johnson, Tyson, and Winter 1985 on The Beethoven Sketchbooks, particularly Chapter II, pp.45–67, with pp.55–58 on rastrology.) The first staffline of each page is indented 3.1 cm from the left-hand system and bears a run-in header: "N°____". We will study the loose gathering structure and the contents of these items as they now appear and then consider their reconstruction as a single item. Figure 3.4 (on the next page) shows the gathering structure and contents of A-Wn F 21 Berg 65:
Figure 3.4 Sketchbook A-Wn F 21 Berg 65
Gathering Structure Brief Description of Contents
black cardboard cover

Folios

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>recto</th>
<th>verso</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1: two-part counterpoint exercises in ink</td>
<td>ditto, more developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2: ditto</td>
<td>blank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3: sketch, op.4/1: mm.1-2</td>
<td>blank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/1: 15-17</td>
<td>verbal notes (blue pencil)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/1: 18-25</td>
<td>blank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/2: notes</td>
<td>blank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7: list of opera titles</td>
<td>op.4/5: motives; 4/4: 6-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8: op.4/5: motives</td>
<td>4/2: 1-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9: 4/2: 8-13 (end)</td>
<td>unidentifiable jottings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10: 4/2: 5-7 instr. sketch</td>
<td>notes re: Mahler,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11: ... Das Lied von der Erde: Der Abschied ...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12: ... lower; upper concerns for texts for 4/1, 4/3, 4/5, and 4/5: 10-12 oboe melody</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13: - half-sheet, approx. width 7 cm, rounded cut edge</td>
<td>originally glued upside down to 14v, contents:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/1: 8-9, top motive</td>
<td>4/1: 5-7, same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/1: 3-5 [cf. ... f.3v]</td>
<td>4/1: 9-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15: 4/1: 12-14</td>
<td>4/1: 15-17 (cf. fol.4r)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16: 4/1: 18-22</td>
<td>unidentifiable jottings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17: unidentifiable jottings</td>
<td>4/1: 23-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18: - 4/1: 25-27</td>
<td>4/1: 28-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19: - 4/1: 31-32</td>
<td>blank</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Back cover inside cover: notes for formal design, also op.6 related? (Also fol.21: extra leaf, 22.5 x 14.5 cm, not music paper; this is a half-sheet of accounting paper with draft biographical notes concerning Berg’s period of instruction with Schoenberg, in pen and ink; considered Berg 65/ii.)

Note: I am indebted to Mark DeVoto (1989; and personal communication) for sharing his own notes on Berg 65 with me for comparative purposes. The difficulties of the document may still have resulted in some errors of detail.

+NB*: folio 20v has fragmentary sketching for the contrabass parts of 4/1: 16-17 and also contains nearly indecipherable verbal notes for that passage; above, a rhythmic sketch that undeniably combines motives 1, 2, and 3 of the op.6 Marsch with additional almost illegible verbal notes likely pertaining to it. The placement on the page suggests that the Marsch sketch must have been there first. This, in turn, suggests that this earliest sketch for Opus 6 may date July-September 1912, based on Berg’s correspondence with Webern (discussed below). (The inside cover is discussed with A-Wst below.)
As Figure 3.4 indicates, folio 20v of Berg 65 contains a sketch of the combination of three rhythmic figures that is found in m.4 of the Marsch. To explain its presence, however, we must digress to a description of the make-up and contents of the document. Berg 65 begins with four pages of counterpoint exercises and then continues with extremely messy but fairly continuous sketches for the first two Altenberglieder. The gathering diagram in Fig.3.4 shows that Berg 65, as it exists now, consists of two gatherings: folios 1–12 and folios 14–20, with a singleton half-sheet folio 13 between them. However, bifolio 3/4 is inserted loosely between folios 2 and 5; it contains sketches for op.4/1, mm.1–2 and 15–17. This disjunction suggests a possible reassignment of location. And, in fact, it appears that the loose bifolio 3/4 originally embraced the gathering of folios 14 through 20. We can ascertain this because the sketch on 3v continues directly onto folio 14.

Physical evidence also indicates that the half-sheet folio 13 was torn (probably from folio 19), trimmed with scissors, and then (used upside down) glued to folio 14v so that that leaf was extended outwards to the left. This effected a continuity sketch from folio 3v (op.4/1, mm.1–2 more developed) to 14r (mm.3–5), to 13v half-sheet upside down (mm.5–7), to 13r (mm.8–9), to 14v (mm.9–11) and so on normally through 16r (m.18–22). Then we find the facing pages of a bifolio with unidentified jottings. This two-page spread was likely used before the song sketches got to this point; so the sketches continue on 17r (m.23–25) through 19r (mm.31–32). Folio 19 is a half-sheet (its missing half, as we noted, was probably used to form half-sheet folio 13). Folio 19v (the flip side of the half-sheet stub) was, therefore, left blank, and Berg used 20r to rework m.29–32.

We now describe the front gathering of Berg 65, for though its contents do not include Opus 6, the gathering establishes connections with the
Stadtbibliothek sketchbook and with the Passacaglia-Fragment. With the relocation of bifolio 3/4, the front gathering consists of bifolio 1/12 nesting bifolios 2/11, 5/10, 6/9, and 7/8. Folios 1 and 2 contain two-part counterpoint sketches in ink. Berg began sketching ideas for op.4/1 on folio 5 (mm.18-25, the accompaniment and beginning of the vocal part, the pitches of both differing considerably from the score), but retreated to verbal notes (folio 5v, in the blue pencil also found in the counterpoint exercises), a rough idea for op.4/2 (folio 6, labelled “II”), and various jottings for nos. 4 and 5 (folio 7v). Facing folios 8v and 9 contain a messy but important continuity sketch for op.4/2. The counterpoint exercises (folios 1-2), the checklist of opera titles (folio 7) and the notes on Mahler’s Das Lied von der Erde (folios 10v-12; Berg heard the premiere in Munich 20-11-1911 and afterwards studied the score) typify the use of these sketchbooks as study aids. The last of the Mahler-notes pages (folio 12) also contains notes on the texts for Opus 4 and includes a sketch of the oboe figure of op.4/5 (mm.10-12) that is also found in the published Passacaglia-Fragment (as noted in Chapter 2, above, p.57).

This brings us to the Opus 6 sketch on folio 20v of Berg 65. Description: the sketch consists of the combination of three rhythmic motives (no pitches are definite) found at the opening of the Marsch, and a (highly illegible) verbal description of the way the “Melodie” is to progress from the accompaniment. (A tentative transcription of the whole page is offered in Chapter 7, p.386.) Lower on the page, additional text flows around a boxed-off passage that contains a detail sketch (imprecise) of the doublebass parts of op.4/1, mm.15-17. The revised gathering structure would have folio 4r follow 20v; it, too, contains rough details for mm.15-17; 4v is blank, the end page of the gathering. In addition, we should also acknowledge here that the inside back cover of Berg 65 (which currently follows fol.20v) has verbal notes
for a four-movement-in-one-movement formal outline: this outline corresponds to one found in the later gatherings of the Stadtbibliothek sketchbook (p.26), a relationship which the proposed amalgamation of the two sketchbooks clarifies.

*Dating:* folio 20v immediately follows the continuity sketch for op.4/1. DeVoto (1967, 86-95) has conjectured, on the basis of Berg’s correspondence with Webern and on the cyclic-motivic correspondences in the five op.4 songs, that the order of composition was likely 4–3–5–2–1. Note that the suggested reassignment of the gathering structure of this sketchbook matches DeVoto’s conjecture in that it places the continuity sketch for no.2 (folios 8v–9r) before that for no.1 (principally folios 3v–20r).

Though the order of the sketches does not of course necessarily speak to the final order of the composition in score, it becomes highly attractive to connect the Opus 6 sketch on folio 20v with Berg’s letters to Webern of 29–07–1912 and 05–09–12. In the first letter, Berg says that he hopes to finish the orchestral songs: “And then in Vienna something big.—I feel it enormously urgent and compelling. If only my health holds.” (Reich 1965, 39; DeVoto 1967, 87) In the second letter [often cited as 05–08–12 but clearly a response to Webern’s letter of 30–08–12], Berg refers to a “third” song which is bigger than the two Webern already knows, and a “fourth” which is shorter than the others, and that there will be five songs in all. These references are likely to songs 5 and 2 (DeVoto 1967, 91); the remaining song would be number 1. Berg says that he will finish no.2 shortly and that after completing the five songs (no.1 remaining) he intends “to start something bigger, for orchestra.” (Redlich 1957a, 78; DeVoto 1967, 87). Not unreasonably, the “something bigger” has traditionally been associated with Opus 6 (though sometimes also with the ‘Symphony project’), yet Berg first refers to a “march” only two years
later (in a letter to Schoenberg, 26–03–1914). The evidence of Berg 65 folio 20v, however, strongly indicates that the Marsch was percolating back in the Summer of 1912. Given that the continuity sketch for song 1 ends on folio 20 and that the rhythmic sketch for the Marsch is placed at the top of 20v, it seems entirely probable that Berg’s “something big ... enormously urgent and compelling” is captured in this sketch augury of the orchestral work that eventually became the Opus 6 Marsch. Perhaps even the reference to his health is prophetic, for though Berg could only have been dimly aware of the work’s final shape at this time, it would eventually become the Marsch eines Astmatikers.

Figure 3.5, on the next page, provides gathering and contents information for the related Stadtbibliothek sketchbook, A-Wst MH 14.263/c.
Figure 3.5  Sketchbook A-Wst MH 14.263/c
Gathering Structure  Brief Description of Contents
tape-bound white paper cover

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>pages</th>
<th>(recto)</th>
<th>(verso)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1: endpaper</td>
<td>blank except for library stamp</td>
<td>2: verbal notes, shopping list</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:°° ms...</td>
<td>3 systems, 4/4, &quot;GA&quot; tremolo vaguely like M. m.79, Sym-Frag.</td>
<td>4:°° one 4-line system, in 3/4 not identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:°°</td>
<td>op.5/3, m.9 chord only</td>
<td>6:°° blank, library siglum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:</td>
<td>ctpt ex.: C.F.+ inv.&amp;imit.</td>
<td>8: inv of suspensions a3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:</td>
<td>C.F.+2nd&amp;3rd species; susps.</td>
<td>10: &quot;&quot; (blue pencil)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:</td>
<td>+stub 1sys2 4m imit. @6th below</td>
<td>12: a2, a3 free imitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:</td>
<td>+stub 4m canonic imit a2</td>
<td>14: a2, two exx. free imit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:</td>
<td>table—inv@8ve, C.F.+lower</td>
<td>16: table—inv@5th &amp; 3rd [sic]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:</td>
<td>4m free imit a2</td>
<td>18: 4m free inv ctpt a2, ink</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19:</td>
<td>a3 free, purple pencil, and a2 imit. in ink, +bass in pencil</td>
<td>20: 5m free inv, like p.18, ink</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21:</td>
<td>↓ 2 lines; vague M rh, R rh</td>
<td>22: M pickup rh mm.91, 107 P &quot;Mitte Anfang&quot; m.24-27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23:</td>
<td>↓ P mm.4-11 chords; &quot;A1&quot;&quot;A2&quot; ↓</td>
<td>24: P &quot;A3&quot; m.12-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25:</td>
<td>↓ R rough rh chords/tune m.4 ↓</td>
<td>26: P &quot;A4&quot; m.39-41; &amp; form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27:</td>
<td>↓ P motive m.11 but 15va ↓</td>
<td>28: R waltz idea, rh transition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29:</td>
<td>M rh m.107, registral creeping</td>
<td>30: M &quot;Finale&quot; motive m.149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31:</td>
<td>M motives mm.149, 102</td>
<td>32: R&amp;P chords, R m.5, P. m.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33:°°</td>
<td>op.5/3, m.9-13, rough</td>
<td>34:°° P layout &quot;a...k&quot;, m.4-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35:°°</td>
<td>op.5/3, m.9-13, also rough</td>
<td>36:°° op.5/2, m.2-4, tentative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37:</td>
<td>op.5/2, m.6-10, mostly T-4</td>
<td>38: triplet sixteenth (cf. M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39:</td>
<td>P chords &quot;a...k&quot;; +MT m.18-19</td>
<td>40: &quot;A4&quot; P? cf.m.37, not clear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41:</td>
<td>op.5/2, mm.1-6, T4</td>
<td>42: cad.; cf A-Wn 13/ii, p.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43:</td>
<td>M vague rh, cf. m.53</td>
<td>44: R: &quot;eventuell Walzer&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45:</td>
<td>↓ P opening chord twice</td>
<td>46: expenses, packing list</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47:</td>
<td>fig.bass symbols, scalar descent</td>
<td>48: blank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[49]:</td>
<td>blank, loose extra page</td>
<td>[50]: blank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[51]:</td>
<td>blank, l.h. side once glued</td>
<td>[52]: blank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[53]:</td>
<td>inside back cover</td>
<td>[54]: outside back cover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(back cover paper not original?, taped to front endpaper)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
same paper size, type, and rastral as A-Wn F 21 Berg 65 (Fig.3.4, above);
A-Wst library gave this item page numbers rather than folio numbers;
↓ =page used upside down; °° =two holes roughly punched
As can be seen from Figure 3.5, the gathering structure of MH 14.263/c (=Wst) is largely in disarray. Indeed, it is unlikely that the original structure can be completely recovered, and the sketchbook may have been dismembered by Berg himself as a matter of creative convenience. However, various physical details allow us to suggest some reconstructive possibilities. Pages 7 through 20 contain a variety of short exercises in counterpoint: with cantus firmus (C.F.), in combined species, in strict and free imitation, and in inversion, and with notes on invertibility at the 8ve, 5th(12th?), and 3rd(10th?). Pages 11 and 13 both have remainder stubs (1-1.5 cm in width) of torn pages, which indicates they were originally part of bifolios whose partner page is now missing; page 19 is also a singleton. If we assume these missing partners, there would originally have been a gathering of five bifolios of counterpoint exercises. This matches the gathering of five bifolios which begins our revised structure of Berg 65. Moreover, the counterpoint exercises which occupy the first two folios of Berg 65 match those in this sketchbook. Perhaps this A–Wst gathering precedes the Berg 65 gathering in a combined reconstruction. (We will summarize the proposed reconstruction following the description of this item.)

Pages 21 to 28 of Wst form a unit consisting of bifolio 21/27 and two singleton inserts 23 and 25. Pages 23, 24, and 26 (which should be read before its verso 25) form an important continuity sketch for the Präludium. (The sketch is transcribed and discussed in Chapter 4, pp.160–162.) As the brief contents listing of Figure 3.5 shows, the interior pages of bifolio 21/27 (pages 22 and 27) contain Präludium sketches as well, while the outside pages (21 and 28) contain material related to the Marsch and to Reigen. All of these pages were used upside down, in which regard they match page 45 (with its upside-down Präludium opening chord). Since the latter’s verso (page 46)
contains a verbal packing/expense list written perpendicularly across the staves, leaf 45/46 was likely last in the combined sketchbook. (Page 46 is, at present, the last page of Wst.) If this removable upside-down gathering (pp.21–28) can be associated with the other upside-down page (p.45), the gathering—which contains the most detailed sketches for the Präludium—may properly belong at the end of the reconstituted sketchbook.

The remaining Opus 6 sketches in the Stadtbibliothek source are mixed up with sketches for the Clarinet Pieces, op.5. Pages 3/4, 5/6, 33/34, and 35/36 contain two roughly punched holes that suggest they were once held together with a pin or clip of some kind. (The pages are marked “oo” on Fig.3.5.) The purpose was evidently to gather together the sketches for (two of) the Opus 5 Clarinet Pieces. Pages 5, 33, and 35 (all op.5/3, mm.9–15) could have been stacked in this manner. Page 36 (the verso of 35) contains a very tentative sketch for op.5/2, mm.2–4. Page 37, though it has no holes, continues with a more detailed sketch for op.5/2, mm.6–10. (Though not at pitch, the sketch is mostly at T4—a fascinating feature since “augmented-triad”/T4 relations govern the piece in its final form.) Page 37 also begins a new bifolio; and it is cross-referenced with a “+” to page 41, which begins yet another bifolio and contains a sketch (also mostly T4) for the immediately preceding measures of op.5/2 (mm.1–6).

This artificial stacking of Opus 5 items resulted in a fragmentary sequence of Opus 6 sketches on their versos or attached folios, as I will now show. As Fig.3.5 indicates, page 5 (op.5/3) is part of bifolio 3/5. The sketch on page 3 has very tenuous associations with the Marsch (m.79) and perhaps also with the Symphonie-Fragment: specifically, the sketch calls for a G–A tremolo and has a prominent [014] trichord. The verso, page 4, has a single four-line system with unidentifiable ideas; and page 6 (the verso of page 5) is
blank. (The blank page 6 suggests that the bifolio may once have been used as a folder; perhaps for op.5 items, since the connection of the material on pp.3–4 to Opus 6 is decidedly oblique.)

The verso (page 34) of the clarinet sketch on page 33 (op.5/3), contains a rhythmic layout of the chordal structure of Präludium mm.4–16; the bifolio page 39, attached to the clarinet sketch on page 37 contains the Präludium sequence of chords itself, the chords labelled a–k. Both sketches were superseded by the continuity sketch of pages 23–26. The other two pages of that bifolio (37/39) contain a fragmentary Marsch rhythm (page 38, perhaps intended as the triplet sixteenth pickup figure) and a highly tentative sketch for the post-climactic explosion of cyclic themes in the Präludium, mm.37–39 (page 40, quite vague: pitch and precise rhythmic details are absent). The latter is labelled “A4”, a label which is, again, taken from the more detailed continuity sketch (page 26) that superseded it. The layout of these items indicates that sketchwork on the Clarinet Pieces, the Marsch and the Präludium proceeded simultaneously through the summer of 1913.

The Stadtbibliothek sketchbook contains a few other notable Opus 6 items. The revised gathering structure would place page 29 directly after Berg 65 folio 4v. Folio 4v, the reader will recall, closed our revision of the gathering structure of Berg 65; and it was preceded by the remarkable (fol.20v) sketch of the opening rhythms of the Marsch. The sketch on page 29 of Wst shows the rhythm for the martellato march section (mm.107ff) as well as two 'generic' sketches: one shows registrally-displaced chromatic creeping, the other features an additive rhythmic pattern (both techniques are prominent in Opus 6). The verso of this sketch, page 30, has the heading “Finale: Mäßiges Marsch[tempo] [or perhaps ‘marcia’]” and the rhythm of m.149ff. Next, page 31 contains rhythms (and a few pitch details) for several of the
Marsch ideas (notably the figure at m.149, again, and the combination of ideas [motives XXV and XXVII, as we shall later identify them after DeVoto 1984] found at m.102). Though all of these sketches are tentative, we do find some of the generative rhythmic ideas for the Marsch in these pages of the Wst.

Page 32 (verso of 31) contains an extremely interesting sketch that shows the descending chordal pattern [delta-1] of Reigen, and, below it, the similar pattern (quoted as parenthetic ‘fore-echo’) near the end of the Präludium.

(The details of this sketch—which demonstrates that the Reigen version was conceived first—are discussed in Chapter 5, p.233.)

Finally, pages 42–44—the remainder of the bifolio with the sketch for op.5/2 (page 41)—contain sketches with cross-reference to our next sketchbook, A-Wn F 21 Berg 13/ii. Page 42 has a cadential figure (preceded by “tremolo”) which, though unassignable, is carried forward to page 9 of Berg 13/ii. (Page 43 has a few vague march rhythms.) And page 44 has a tentative sketch for the transition of Reigen with the indication “der umgekehrte Motif” and “eventuell Walzer.” The “Walzer” itself, however, is not found in Wst, but it is found on a page from that sketchbook which is now glued into Berg 13/ii (p.47/48 there).

Before moving to Berg 13/ii, we summarize our proposed amalgamation of the two earlier sketchbooks. The suggested reconstruction of the gatherings of Berg 65 and MH 14.263/c as one sketchbook, with abbreviated descriptions of the contents of the sections, follows (on the next page) as Figure 3.6:
Figure 3.6  Sketchbooks Berg 65 and MH14.263/c combined
abbreviations for Opus 6: P=Praludium, R=Reigen, M=Marsch
↓=page used upside down; °°=two holes roughly punched

A-Wn Berg 65
black cardboard cover
A-Wst MH 14.263/c endpaper
A-Wst pp.7-20 counterpoint exercises (originally 5 bifolios)
A-Wn fol.1-2 counterpoint exercises (5 bifolios)
fol.5-6, 7v-8 jottings and notes for op.4
fol.7r, 10v-12 opera titles and notes on Mahler
fol.8v-9 continuity sketch of op.4/2
fol.12v linked directly to
A-Wn fol.3 fol.3; continuity sketch of op.4/1
fol.13(↓) fol.13 upside-down half-sheet, glued to fol.14v
fol.14-19 op.4/1 continued (originally 5 bifolios)
fol.20 op.4/1, mm.29-32 reworked (fol.18 now single)
fol.20v Opus 6 M rh sketch; op.4/1, mm.15-17 detail
fol.4r op.4/1, mm.15-17 rough detail
fol.4v blank, end of gathering
A-Wst p.29/30
p.31/32 M rh m.107 / "Finale: Mäßiges Marsch[tempo]"
p.3/4°° M rh ideas m.149, m.102 / R&P chords
p.5/6°° (M tentative GA tremolo m.79) / unassignable
p.33/34°° - op.5/3, m.9 chord / blank
p.35/36°° - op.5/3, m.9-13 / P rh layout of chords "a-k"
p.37/38 op.5/3, m.9-13 / op.5/2, m.2-4, tentative
p.39/40 op.5/2, m.6-10 (T4) / (M rh triplet sixteenth)
p.41/42 P chords "a-k" + MT m.18-19 / P "A4" cf. m.37
p.43/44 op.5/2, m.1-6 (T4) / "cadence," cf. Berg 13/ii p.9
[p.47/48]
[p.49-50] (M tentative rh) / R "eventuell Walzer"
[p.51-52] R "Walzer" / M rh tentative cf. m.62 grazioso
[p.47/48] (M, P, R rh ?) / M triplet pickups, P "Mitte"
[p.47/48] P continuity m.4-11 "A1" "A2" / "A3" m.12-19
[p.47/48] P A4 m.39-41, form note / R rh "immer leise"
[p.47/48] P m.11-13 idea (but 15va) / R metric transition
[p.47/48] P first chord twice / expenses/packing list
[p.47/48] [loose folios originally from bifolios laid in at the back ... ]
[p.47/48] figured bass under melodic descent, verso blank
[p.47/48] perhaps belongs with counterpoint studies
[p.47/48] unnumbered blank single folio torn from bifolio
[p.47/48] unnumbered blank single folio torn from bifolio
A-Wst endpaper [original?, hinged to p.47/48 with quad-graph paper]
A-Wn Berg 65 back cover: inside cover has verbal notes on a
formal design [discussed below]
As Figure 3.6 shows, the combined sketchbook would begin with the Wn Berg 65 covers and continue with the Wst endpapers. At present, both contain loose gatherings. In the combined sketchbook, the Wst counterpoint gathering (pp.7–20) would come first, followed by the similar counterpoint exercises of Berg 65 (fol.1–2). The Berg 65 gathering would continue (through fol.12) with various jottings for op.4, the list of opera titles and notes on Mahler, and the continuity sketch for op.4/2. Sketches for op.4/1 begin on folio 12v and continue through the next gathering: bifolio 3/4 enclosing folios 14–20 (with half-sheet fol.13 added).

In this revision, the brief Marsch sketch on fol.20v would be quite proximate to the next gathering, Wst bifolio 29/30–45/46 with its various inserted leaves. This Wst gathering begins with Marsch ideas (pp.29–31) and with the Reigen and Präludium chords (p.32), then inserts the stack of hole-punched sketches for op.5/3 and op.5/2. As stated earlier, we find a few preliminary sketches for the Präludium attached to several of these Opus 5 sketches (pp.34, 39, 40). Page 44 of the gathering concerns the Reigen "Walzer"; for this reason, it is suggested that the "Walzer" sketch now found in Berg 13/ii (pp.47–48 there) originally belonged here. The pages in the final part of the gathering, used upside down (pp.21–28), contain the important continuity sketches for the beginning and retransition of the Präludium. The manuscript pages of the combined sketchbook probably closed with the expense list on page 46 of Wst.
The ‘figured-bass sketch’ (p.47) perhaps originally belonged with the counterpoint studies; it and the two blank folios (pp.49/50 and 51/52) were originally torn from bifolios and are now laid in at the back of the Wst sketchbook. In the restructuring, the four-movements-in-one-movement formal outline found on the inside back cover of Berg 65 can now be seen to correspond with the outline found on page 25 of the Präludium sketches in Wst. Both outlines refer to a Scherzo section B, an Adagio section C, and to a Finale (which page 29 of Wst says is in “Mäßiges Marsch[tempo]).” This schema, clearly modelled on Schoenberg’s Chamber Symphony, reflects the form of the Präludium at the time (Summer 1913) when it was still conceived as the opening section of a projected symphonic cycle. (See Chapter 2, pp.61-62 and Chapter 4, p.162.)

The back cover outline identifies the principal means of accomplishing the transition between movements as ideas A1 through A4. These labels are also used in the continuity sketch for the Präludium found on pages 23-26 of Wst. And the musical ideas cited by these labels on the back cover of Berg 65 are in all likelihood the same as those identified in the Wst sketch. The “A2” idea, for example, which in the sketch corresponds to the fortissimo interjection, Präludium, mm.11-13 (and Marsch, “flashback,” mm.160-161), is—appropriately enough—described as “klagend” on the back-cover formal outline of Berg 65.

As amalgamated, the sketchbook has 45 folios, counting Berg 13/ii p.47-48 in its presumed original location near p.44 of MH 14.263/c, and not
counting Berg 65 fol.13 on the assumption that it was formerly the other half of fol.19. Given the various missing bifolio partners and balancing these against the appended blank singletons, the reconstituted sketchbook would be approximately 48 to 50 manuscript folios. This count corresponds quite closely to that of bound sketchbook Berg 13/ii, to which we now turn.

**Sketchbook A-Wn F 21 Berg 13/ii.**

The most important source of sketches for Berg's Opus 6 *Marsch* is also—in its second half—the most important source of his earliest sketches for *Wozzeck*. Description: Nationalbibliothek item F 21 Berg 13/ii is a bound sketchbook with black softcovers. A rough-cut label (2.5 cm x 1.0 cm) in the lower left corner of the cover bears the handwritten title "Wozzeck."

Sketchbook 13/ii is oblong in format, 17 cm x 12 cm. The rastral information is: 10-line manuscript, total span 9.8 cm, single span 0.5 cm, total length 15.4 cm. The first staffline of each page is indented 3.1 cm from the left-hand system and bears a run-in header: "N^0.____". The reader will note that this rastral information matches the earlier sketchbooks save for the presence of the period in "N^0." in the run-in header. In addition, the first page of each bifolio bears the manufacturer's format number for this type of sketchbook: "N^0. 70." This indication, not found in the earlier sketchbooks, is printed (bottom-to-top) in the margin between staves 8 and 9.

The pagination provided by the library begins with the endpapers (pages 1 and 2) and continues with the pages of manuscript (pages 3 through
98); the final endpapers are unnumbered. Pages 4, 24, and 97–98 are blank. For the second (Wozzeck) half of the sketchbook, Berg provided his own stamped pagination in the upper outer corner of each page, beginning with page 50, stamped 1 (upside down), and ending with page 98, stamped 49. Stamp numbers 38 and 39 are not found, which suggests that a Wozzeck-related leaf is missing (though he also forgot to stamp pages 53/54).

**Dating.** Berg attended the performance of Büchner's play on May 5th, 1914. We know he began sketches for an opera on the subject almost immediately after seeing that performance (Kassowitz 1968). The second half of the sketchbook was therefore begun shortly after 1914-05-05. And internal evidence suggests that the same date—or shortly thereafter—is the terminus for the Opus 6 sketches as well. The Marsch sketches stop abruptly at the end of the first half of the sketchbook. Indeed, they cram the border, as if Berg had just decided to reserve the second half of the book for Wozzeck but felt the need to add a few more ideas for the Marsch in this small sketch format before proceeding with the Particell stage. Later, as noted in our description of the Stadtbibliothek sketchbook, Berg carried forward to 13/ii a sketch for the Reigen "Walzer." The sketch is written on the paper type of the earlier sketchbook (A-Wst MH 14.263/c; there is no period in the run-in header). It is glued into 13/ii (now as pages 47/48), inserted into the Marsch sketches and attached to the last page (page 49) of the first half of the sketchbook. Though the date of this insertion into 13/ii cannot be determined, the sketch itself
belongs with the earlier Stadtbibliothek materials. The folio, therefore, seems "filed" at the location rather than used there.

In general, the disjunction between the two halves of 13/ii—the decision to dedicate the second half of the sketchbook to Wozzeck even before the Marsch was fully sketched, before the Präludium achieved its Opus 6 form, and while Reigen was scarcely begun—testifies to the impact the performance of Büchner's play had on Berg. It was an epiphany in his compositional life. Given this context, the contents of the last pages of the first half of 13/ii have especially heightened biographical significance. (Aspects of this significance were discussed in Chapter 2; further considerations relating to the composition of Reigen and the Marsch are discussed in Chapters 5 and 7, respectively.)

Unlike Berg 65 and the Stadtbibliothek sketches, Berg 13/ii remains largely intact as a commercially-bound sketchbook. Its gathering structure and a very brief description of the contents of each page are shown in Figure 3.7 (on the next two pages). Sketches that are too tentative to be assigned to particular passages are marked "?". More detailed discussion of selected sketches takes place in our treatment of the Marsch (in Chapter 7). The physical sketchbook structure shown in Figure 3.7 (on the next two pages) has several corresponding subdivisions with respect to contents, with breaks at pages 5, 13, 25, 35, and 50. (These breaks concern the Opus 6 portion of the sketchbook. The Wozzeck portion begins at page 50; its contents and subdivisions are briefly described on the second page of Figure 3.7.)
Figure 3.7 Sketchbook A-Wn Berg 13/ii, gathering structure and contents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Gathering</th>
<th>Brief Description of Contents recto page / verso page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1/2</td>
<td>black softcover</td>
<td>endpaper; floorplan diagram of Berg's Trauttmansdorffgasse residence / verbal jotting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/4</td>
<td>[bifolio with p.67/68] verbal note, list of supplies / blank</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/6</td>
<td>&quot;Schluß&quot; (concerns end of M) / cf. M m.4–8 inexact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/8</td>
<td>&quot;Rhythmen&quot; m.3, tune m.20–23 / &quot;Seufzer&quot; syncopation?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/12</td>
<td>&quot;neu&quot; rh M 149 / cf. m.2; blended bass m.6, top m.22–23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13/14</td>
<td>&quot;A&quot; M false start / m.4–9 NB detailed sketch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15/16</td>
<td>M m.10–14 NB continuation of p.14 / EH melody m.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/18</td>
<td>M tentative m.25 / m.22, with developments not used?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19/20</td>
<td>&quot;C3&quot; M m.46 idea / &quot;D&quot; idea of m.31 in form of m.76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/22</td>
<td>&quot;C4&quot; M cf. m.53 &quot;scherzend&quot;; m.78–82 idea / &quot;Pauken-wirbel&quot; Eb–Db, &quot;E,&quot; &quot;Orgelpunkt&quot; also cf. m.80 etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23/24</td>
<td>cf. M m.80 &quot;aufsteigernde Akkord,&quot; &quot;E,&quot; zu D&quot; / blank</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25/26</td>
<td>M formal outline: Aab &quot;ausspinnen&quot; (plus fragments of ideas mm.20, 46), Episode (rh of m.39), C1234, D, E; ideas of mm.6–8 (cf. mm.83–84) / &quot;Mitteltheil&quot; verbal description suggests m.46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/28</td>
<td>M m.38–44 (doodles on right) / ideas from m.45–53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29/30</td>
<td>M stretto trials of idea at m.76 / transforms of idea m.46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31/32</td>
<td>M fragmentary idea for m.53 / m.47–52 more detail</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33/34</td>
<td>M m.53 rh continuation, soon? / fragment rh of m.76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35/36</td>
<td>blank / &quot;III Th&quot; hints of m.62 and m.76, ideas not used</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37/38</td>
<td>M m.39 canonic trial not used / rh ideas for m.83–91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39/40</td>
<td>M fragmentary ideas m.28–30, ref to m.76(78) / &quot;Ende&quot; ideas for m.129–135 and &quot;Wogend&quot; m.136, plus planned recapitulation of ideas from m.11 (not done)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41/42</td>
<td>continuation of m.11 idea; rh m.76, m.56 (cf. m.171) / ideas for an &quot;Episode&quot; not used</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43/44</td>
<td>idea for repetition of bass idea m.9–10 (not done) / rh mm.55–59 etc. accompaniment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45/46</td>
<td>M rh grazioso idea m.62–66 / M big tune m.66, but 12th lower (cf. derivation from m.6 EH at that pitch)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47/48</td>
<td>&quot;Walzer&quot; Wst Reigen sketch trimmed and glued to p.49 / rh of grazioso idea continuation; idea cf. A4 Wst p.40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49/50</td>
<td>[continues from p.46]: M top rh m.78–84; lower rh stretto m.72–75 / stamp number &quot;1&quot; (upside down) first page of sketches for Wozzeck: unused chords and ideas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Figure 3.7  A-Wn Berg 13/ii continued**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Gathering</th>
<th>Brief Description of Contents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>51/52</td>
<td>2/3&quot; chords and idea fragments not used / ditto, but includes waltz idea with prominent 014 cell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53/54</td>
<td>no stamped numbers] unused ideas / waltz ideas unused</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55/56</td>
<td>&quot;4/5&quot; &quot;Wirtshausszene&quot; &quot;Polka&quot; cf. Act 3/iii not used / list of characters and voice types</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57/58</td>
<td>&quot;6/7&quot; verbal note on character of Captain / unused idea</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59/60</td>
<td>&quot;8/9&quot; mostly blank, idea linking 2/i to 2/ii, m.170-171 / funeral march interlude (not used)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61/62</td>
<td>&quot;10/11&quot; &quot;Straße Fortsetzung&quot; 2/ii, ideas / m.193-196</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63/64</td>
<td>&quot;12/13&quot; m.196-201 / waltz idea 2/ii, m.202, not final form</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65/66</td>
<td>&quot;14/15&quot; unused &quot;Ländler&quot; idea for 2/iv / 2/ii, m.191-198</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67/68</td>
<td>[bifolio with p.3/4] &quot;16/17&quot; continues p.66 m.198-204 / m.192-196</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69/70</td>
<td>&quot;18/19&quot; unused waltz ideas m.201ff / ditto continued</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71/72</td>
<td>&quot;20/21&quot; ditto ended / &quot;Fortsetzung v. 16&quot; rh m.204-214</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73/74</td>
<td>&quot;22/23&quot; continued m.214-225 / m.226-231 &quot;Fortsetzung Krebsgang. (Walzer.)&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75/76</td>
<td>&quot;24/25&quot; m.232-243 / m.244-254</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77/78</td>
<td>&quot;26/27&quot; m.255-271 / ideas for next section? , unused</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79/80</td>
<td>&quot;28/29&quot; verbal formal outline for rest of 2/ii / Themes for triple fugue: Captain m.287-290, Doctor rh m.293-296</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81/82</td>
<td>&quot;30/31&quot; unused &quot;Zapfenstreich&quot; (tattoo) / m.287-289</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83/84</td>
<td>&quot;32/33&quot; m.272-275, (276-277), m.277-278, 282-283 / continuations m.279-280, 284-285</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85/86</td>
<td>&quot;34/35&quot; rh and plan m.286-296 / continuation m.296-317</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87/88</td>
<td>&quot;36/37&quot; plan with ideas m.318, 326 / plan for m.329-366</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89/90</td>
<td>[missing Wozzeck sketch page numbers stamped 38 &amp; 39]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91/92</td>
<td>&quot;40/41&quot; verbal notes, &quot;Wozzecktheme&quot; 2/ii (not used)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93/94</td>
<td>chords for Act 1/ii , not in final form</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95/96</td>
<td>&quot;42/43&quot; 1/ii m.212-222, not in final form / verbal formal outline for 1/ii</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97/98</td>
<td>&quot;44/45&quot; continues p.92 / chords for 1/ii, not final form</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[endpaper]</td>
<td>&quot;46/47&quot; continues p.94 / more ideas for 1/ii?, not used</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[back cover]</td>
<td>&quot;48/49&quot; blank / blank</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[preceding page attached to this endpaper, and to cover]
Beginning at page 5, we find in tentative form several of the 'turning-point' ideas for the Marsch: the closing, the opening, the climactic entry at m.149, the important "Trillertheme" (m.2), and a sketch that blends the relation between the development of the opening bass idea and the English horn melody in m.20 (both based on cyclic theme alpha). Beginning at page 13, we find detailed sketches of the opening, including the 'false start', and then progressively less detailed sketches of the ideas at m.20, m.25 (quite tentative), and the alphabetically designated ideas C3 (m.46), D (m.76), and E (mm.78–83).

Page 25 then pauses to lay these ideas out in a formal outline. And, after a verbal description of the "Mitteltheil" (m.46), a fairly detailed sketch of the "Episode" (m.39) follows. (This makes sense since the preceding pages already sketched the 'A' section in some detail.) This subdivision of the sketchbook continues with several trial ideas (thematic transformations and combinations) for the important formal divisions at m.46, m.53, and m.76.

The next subdivision, beginning at p.35, includes several trial ideas not ultimately used; e.g., the canonic treatment of the Episode idea, the recapitulation of mm.9–10 (though the idea at m.11 recurs often enough, including the 'three-in-one canonic' version at m.117).

Two other ideas found in this subdivision do occur in the piece: we find sketches for the rhythm of the grazioso theme (mm.62–66, p.45) and for the 'big tune' (mm.66–70, p.46). The latter appears a twelfth lower than in the score (beginning on G3 rather than D5). This is quite interesting because, as
Douglas Jarman has shown (1979: p.43 and Ex.44), this tune can be serially derived from the m.6 English horn idea. In Berg’s sketch, however, the tune is at the same pitch level as the English horn idea (already included in the detailed sketch of m.2–14 on pp.14–15); it was, therefore, clearly derived in a direct manner from that idea and was subsequently transposed up a twelfth in Particell and score. (The passage is discussed further in the Marsch chapter, pp.453–455.)

As far as Opus 6 is concerned, the final major subdivision begins, of course, at page 50, the first stamp-numbered page of the Wozzeck half of the sketchbook. A more detailed inventory of Wozzeck sketches, including those found in 13/ii, has been undertaken by David Fanning (1987, for 13/ii, see p.305). For our purposes, the important points connecting these earliest Wozzeck sketches to Berg’s then-incomplete Opus 6 are highlighted in boldface in Figure 3.7. To summarize: the waltz (II/2) and Ländler (II/4) ideas prefigure the still incomplete Reigen (and the polka [III/3] could also be related to Schnitzler’s play, which calls for an “ordinary Polka” in the gloss for its second scene); the discarded funeral march and “Zapfenstreich” (tattoo) ideas as well as the central multiple-counterpoint concept of the triple fugue in Act II, Scene 2 recall Berg’s most recent sketching (and Particell drafting) efforts for the Marsch; finally, the tentative sketches for the underlying chordal progression of Act I, Scene 2 recall the more extensive underlying chordal basis of the Präludium as found in the Stadtbibliothek sketchbook.
Though specific details of the *Marsch* sketches can only be discussed in the context of the *Marsch* Chapter, a few general observations may be read from Figure 3.7. Most significantly, we note that there are hardly any sketches for the second half of the piece (m.91ff). Either such sketches are missing, or Berg proceeded directly to Particell in the Summer of 1914. The *Marsch* sketches in the first half of the sketchbook do include a few entries for later passages in the work. In fact, the first page (p.5) concerns the close of the movement ("Schluß"); page 11 marks as "new" the rhythm of the climactic statement at m.149 (cf. the opening of the second half, m.91); and page 40, designated "Ende" has ideas for mm.129–135 and the sweeping chordal flux that begins at m.136 ("Wogend"). Beyond these highpoints, however, the sketches concern the first half of the work.

The detailed sketches in 13/ii for the beginning of the *Marsch* show evidence of a 'false start' (p.13) that persisted through the Particell stage; the rationale for this will be discussed in the *Marsch* chapter. The next portion of the *Marsch* opening received the most detailed sketch for all of Opus 6. The sketch, found on pp.14–15 of Berg 13/ii, is reproduced in facsimile and transcription in the *Marsch* chapter. The sketch is, however, quite atypical. Most of the sketches for the *Marsch* consist of rhythmic contours alone, or present only limited pitch content that, even so, often mismatches the version in score. In general, Berg seems more concerned at this early stage of composition with establishing the texture and rhythmic drive of the ideas than with defining their specific pitch content. In this regard, Berg's conceptual-stage pitch sense is clearly less developed, less precise, than what
we know to be the case for Schoenberg and Webern in their pre-twelve-tone works.

On the other hand, Berg's characteristic preoccupation with formal design is easily witnessed in the sketchbooks and may be read directly from even the brief descriptions offered in Figure 3.7. For instance, the alphabetical formal outline for the Marsch found on page 25 of this sketchbook, in association with similarly-designated ideas on other pages, assists in clarifying Berg's conception of the sectional layout. The sketch for the "A" section is remarkably detailed (pp.13-16), as is that for the beginning of the "Episode" (m.39ff, p.27). Otherwise, the ideas which characterize formal subdivisions are quite clear in their general outline but rather imprecise in their pitch and developmental details. For example, the ideas C3 (m.46), D (m.76), and E (m.78-83) show their characteristic rhythmic profiles and many of their pitch details (for at least one form of their appearance), but subsequent sketchwork does not match the score. Rather, the objective of these sketches seems to be the working out of the transformational and combinational potentials of the ideas.

Finally, the description in Figure 3.7 shows that there are no further sketches for Opus 6 in the second half of 13/ii. Indeed, there are no further sketches for Opus 6 anywhere. Either a substantial number of continuity sketches for the second half of the Marsch, for the middle section of the Präludium, and for most of Reigen are missing, or Berg continued work on these pieces on Particell-size pages, discarding those sheets that became too messy.

There is, in general, a considerable gap in musical precision between the materials found in the sketchbook sources and the extremely detailed Particell, a gap not entirely closed by the numerous pencil erasures in the
latter. In his work on Wozzeck, Berg produced numerous 'Klavierskizze' on regular size 12–16 line manuscript that went a long way towards bridging the similar gap there. Such larger format sketches for Opus 6, if they ever existed, are not known. The one seeming exception is the single leaf now found in Berlin (listed on Figure 3.1 above). The leaf is 40 x 29 cm and is of a peculiar 20-line manuscript type: the staff systems are alternately wide and narrow; i.e., single spans of 1 cm alternate with .5 cm spans.

This paper type occurs in only one other place in connection with Opus 6. Folio 4v of A-Wn F 21 Berg 69 (listed on Figure 3.2 above) is an 18-line version of the same paper type: it was apparently at one time used as a cover sheet (or, more likely, the front half of a bifolio folder) for the pages of the autograph score. The page is stamped with Berg's Trauttmansdorffgasse address and, in red ink, bears the title “Drei Orchesterstücke / Op.6 / (Partituraszug)”. There seems, however, no reason on this basis to assume that other pages of this type held sketches for Opus 6.

Indeed, to return to the Berlin item, the musical contents of that leaf appear merely to transfer those of another sketch to the new paper type, specifically the contents of page 5 of Berg 13/ii. From Figure 3.7, above, it is known that this page is the first page in 13/ii with musical sketches, and that it concerns ideas for the end of the Marsch. The Berlin page strikes one almost as a transcription of the sketchbook page, and—in the total absence of other Opus 6 sketches of this type—we must consider that it may actually be a transcription. The verso side of the leaf bears a dedicatory note dated “17/7.[19]31” to an unnamed “Doktor” that states that the sketch must date from 17 or 18 years earlier. It is possible that Berg transferred a number of Wst or 13/ii type sketches to single sheets so that he could physically lay them out in surveying the move from sketch to Particell. It is also perhaps possible
that Berg might have manufactured this memento by transcribing it from sketchbook 13/ii. In any case, the gap between sketch and Particell remains unbridged, even in this anomalous item.

The Particell, A-Wn F 21 Berg 12.

Item A-Wn F 21 Berg 12 is Berg’s working copy of the short score, or “Particell”. It has been bound into hardcovers (26.5 cm x 36 cm) which are decorated with a grey-white-black, finger-painting-like, abstract brush design. (The covers were no doubt a commercially-available product and the binding was done in Berg’s lifetime.) The embossed title on the spine reads: “BERG 3 ORCHESTERSTÜCKE PARTICELL.”

The care with which the Particell was preserved by Berg reflects its enduring value as an editorial last resort. Though the autograph score and the fair copy were eventually sold (now in New York), the Particell and the correction copy of the revised score remained in Berg’s possession and are still part of the Nachlaß. The revised score (A-Wn F 21 Berg 141; further described in Chapter 6), which I have already explained is the Fassung letzter Hand for Opus 6, is also a carefully bound document. And we shall see in our examination of the individual pieces that the Particell can still serve as an contributor, if not a final arbiter, in editor squabbles.

The Particell consists of manuscript in a variety of formats, all of it from Berg’s normal suppliers, Joachim Eberle. Recto pages (some used upside down) bear the format number (e.g., “N°8a” / “26 linig”) below the papermaker’s stamp: “J.E. & C” Protokoll Schutzmarke.” Paper format No.19a, for example, has 24 normal five-line staves plus 3 single lines for percussion. The paper is set up with printed Italian staff names for a basic romantic orchestra disposition: 3222/423/ 3perc+timp/5-part strings, with
two extra staves below. Since this disposition served Berg no useful purpose in his Particell, he always used this paper type upside down.

The Particell has 33 folios in all, plus the covers and the endpapers which are attached to the covers. The general gathering structure is: folios 1–5 Präludium, folios 6–17 Reigen, and folios 18–25, 26–29, and 30–33 Marsch. More detailed assessment of the gathering structure is made difficult by the binding, and has not, in any case, been found particularly revealing. The gathering breakdown is as follows: for the Präludium, bifolios 1/5, and 3/4 with single folio 2; for Reigen, bifolio 6/7 hinged to a nesting of bifolios 8/17, 9/16, 10/15, 11/14 and central 12/13; for the Marsch, bifolio 18/25 surrounds 19/20, 22/23, and singleton 21 stubbed to 24, bifolio 26/29 surrounds 27/28, and bifolio 30/33 surrounds 31/32.

Though predominantly written in graphite pencil, the document contains many entries and overtracings in black ink and fine purple pencil, as well as some entries in red ink (title pages) and red and blue coloured pencil (pertaining to the two-piano arrangement of the Marsch). Berg used black ink for three purposes: (1) to emphatically overtrace pencil entries in order to clarify or alter them; (2) to act as the primary means of entry for the most important thematic idea(s) or for an actual “piano version” of a given passage (particularly in the Präludium)—in either case, the texture is subsequently expanded in pencil within the same system or on an auxiliary system located above or below the piano version; and (3) to tabulate the instrumentation and system requirements needed for the realization of the full score (itself in ink). Overtracings or corrections in black ink could, therefore, have occurred in the early draft stages or at the time of the realization of the full score. The fine purple pencil (often not easily distinguished from the normal graphite type)
was also used as an overtracing or second layer tool in most cases, though it served as the primary entry tool for the first 41 measures of *Reigen*.

Within the Particell, the title pages of each piece appear as follows: Folio 1: Berg's Trauttmansdorffgasse address, lower right. Title: "Opus 6 [red ink] / I. (Praludium [sic, with lead parenthesis, but without Umlaut; in black ink] / (Partiturauszug.) [black ink]". Folio 1v: paste-on sheet (14.4 cm x 22.3 cm) "Drei / Orchesterstücke / Op. 6 / Besetzung" [black ink; the setting corresponds to the first version of the score]. Folio 6: "II." [at top, purple pencil]; "Opus 6 / II. (Reigen) / Partiturauszug" [all red ink, except title "Reigen" which is in pencil]. Folio 18: There is no separate title page for the *Marsch*; this recto folio is the first page of the Particell itself. The top of the page bears evidence of two arrangements undertaken for performances by the *Verein für musikalische Privataufführungen* (Schoenberg's *Society for Private Musical Performances*). (The arrangements are discussed in Chapter 6, pp.287–295; Chapter 7, pp.373–374, provides a facsimile of the first two pages of the *Marsch* Particell.)

**Figure 3.8** (on the next page) tabulates the foliation, paper formats, system and measure breakdown, with additional comments for A-Wn F 21 Berg 12—Berg's Particell for Opus 6. The foliation shown is that provided by the Nationalbibliothek. Paper formats (and number of staff lines) first appear in parentheses when the paper has been used upside down (so that the papermaker's mark only appears on the top right of the verso; that is, on the next page). For each page, the number of systems is given (e.g., 3s): this is followed by the measure numbers which begin each system.
Figure 3.8. A-Wn F 21 Berg 12, Berg's Particell for Opus 6.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gather. Fol. Paper, Lines</th>
<th>Sys:mm.</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 No.31, 30</td>
<td>Präludium title page (see above)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1v</td>
<td>instrumentation list (see above)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>(No.8a, 26) 4s: 1, 5, 8, 11</td>
<td>Präludium ...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2v</td>
<td>3s: 15, 19, 22</td>
<td>pencil below ink piano-sketch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>(No.9, 28) 2s: 25, 29</td>
<td>pencil above redisposed ink piano-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3v</td>
<td>3s: (25, 27, 29)</td>
<td>sketch deleted here; bound 3v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>(No.9, 28) 2s: 32, 35</td>
<td>15-line system required for climax!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4v</td>
<td>3s: 38, 40.5, 43</td>
<td>Berg counted m.40 twice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>No.31, 30 4s: 46, 49, 52, 55-57.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5v</td>
<td>blank (pencilled &quot;I&quot; and ink smudge)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gather. Fol. Paper, Lines | Sys:mm. | Comments |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 No.8, 24</td>
<td>Reigen title page (see above)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6v</td>
<td>2s: 1, 6</td>
<td>Reigen ... (@top: &quot;13/VII&quot; [1915])*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 No.8, 24</td>
<td>2s: 9, 12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7v</td>
<td>2s: 15, 17</td>
<td>some excess harp entries scribbled out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 No.8, 24</td>
<td>2s: 19, 22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8v</td>
<td>2s: 25, 29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 No.8, 24</td>
<td>2s: 33, 36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9v</td>
<td>2s: 39, 43</td>
<td>Berg did not count m.46, last on page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 No.8, 24</td>
<td>2s: 47, 49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10v</td>
<td>2s: 52, 55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 No.8, 24</td>
<td>2s: 58, 61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11v</td>
<td>2s: 65, 68</td>
<td>8-line system req'd for 12-note climax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 No.8, 24</td>
<td>3s: 72, 76, 79</td>
<td>thin texture here: 2-, 3-, 4-line systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12v</td>
<td>2s: 83, 86</td>
<td>6- &amp; 7-line systems, orchestral block!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 No.8, 24</td>
<td>2s: 89, 92</td>
<td>8-line systems req'd for its reworking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13v</td>
<td>2s: 95, 99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 No.8, 24</td>
<td>1s: 105</td>
<td>generous paper use from this point on:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14v</td>
<td>1s: 107</td>
<td>partly due to gathering structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 No.8, 24</td>
<td>1s: 109</td>
<td>but conveys visually in Particell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15v</td>
<td>2s: 111, 114</td>
<td>the dénouement in the score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 No.8, 24</td>
<td>1s: 117-121.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16v</td>
<td>blank</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 No.8, 24</td>
<td>blank</td>
<td>this extra folio is due to gathering structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17v</td>
<td>blank</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[*Further details concerning the dating of Reigen are found in Figure 3.1, p.111; the significance of the text on the top of its title page is explained in Chapter 2, p.88.]
Figure 3.8 [cont’d]. A-Wn F 21 Berg 12, Berg’s Particell for Opus 6.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gather</th>
<th>Fol.</th>
<th>Paper</th>
<th>Lines</th>
<th>Sys:mm.</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>No.8,24</td>
<td>2s: 1, 5</td>
<td>Marsch ... (no title, see above, p.144; NB, below)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18v</td>
<td></td>
<td>2s: 9, 13</td>
<td>ww gliss ballooned above mm.10–11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>No.8,24</td>
<td>2s: 17, 21</td>
<td>(see below, and Chapter 7 re: ‘balloons’)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19v</td>
<td></td>
<td>2s: 25, 29</td>
<td>mm.34–35 ballooned above, after m.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>No.8,24</td>
<td>2s: 36, 40</td>
<td>m.38 ballooned between 37 and 39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20v</td>
<td></td>
<td>2s: 43, 46.5</td>
<td>balloons above mm.44–45, 48–49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>No.8,24</td>
<td>2s: 51, 54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21v</td>
<td></td>
<td>2s: 58, 62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>(No.19a,24)</td>
<td>3s: 65, 67, 70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22v</td>
<td></td>
<td>1s: 73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>(No.19a,24)</td>
<td>3s: 76, 78, 80.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23v</td>
<td></td>
<td>2s: 84, 88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>No.7,22</td>
<td>1s: 92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24v</td>
<td></td>
<td>1s: 95</td>
<td>m.96 ballooned between 95 and 97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>No.8,24</td>
<td>1s: 99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25v</td>
<td></td>
<td>1s: 102</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>No.8,24</td>
<td>1s: 105</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26v</td>
<td></td>
<td>1s: 108</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>(No.19a,24)</td>
<td>2s: 111, 113</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27v</td>
<td></td>
<td>2s: 115, 117</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>(No.19a,24)</td>
<td>1s: 119</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28v</td>
<td></td>
<td>2s: 121, 123</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>(No.19a,24)</td>
<td>1s: 125</td>
<td>11-line system req’d for climax</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29v</td>
<td></td>
<td>2s: 127, 130</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>(No.19a,24)</td>
<td>2s: 133, 136</td>
<td>return of m.25 chords apparent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30v</td>
<td></td>
<td>2s: 140, 143</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>(No.19a,24)</td>
<td>1s: 146</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31v</td>
<td></td>
<td>2s: 149, 152</td>
<td>m.155 ballooned between 154 and 156</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>(No.19a,24)</td>
<td>2s: 157, 160</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32v</td>
<td></td>
<td>1s: 162</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>(No.19a,24)</td>
<td>3s: 164, 166, 168</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33v</td>
<td></td>
<td>2s: 170, 173–174. [at bottom: &quot;14./VII [1914]&quot;]*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[*Further details concerning the dating of the Marsch are found in Figure 3.1, p.111; and in Chapters 2 and 7.]

[NB: fol.18 contains evidence of two arrangements (see above, p.144; and Chapter 6, p.287ff.); it also shows the deletion of two ‘extra’ measures from the beginning, including a variant counterpoint to what is now m.1 (see Chapter 7, p.373 and pp.389–392).]
The measure numbers given in Figure 3.8 are those of the actual score, not those of the Particell: in the Präludium, Berg accidentally counted measure 40 twice because half of it spilled over onto the next system; in Reigen (perhaps less accidentally; see Chapter 5), Berg omitted measure 46. Though the first miscount was corrected in the full score, the second was not caught until the 1923 edition (which, accordingly, has a measure "46a").

The descriptive comments for the Präludium on Figure 3.8 show that the short score for mm.16–31 was first sketched in a “piano version,” a two-system draft in ink, which was then expanded in pencil above or below that system into the more detailed Particell. In the case of folio 3v, however, Berg found he had insufficient room to expand the three-system piano sketch. He therefore wrote “Auszug —> ” on the top of the page, redisposed the piano sketch in two systems on the recto side and expanded it there. Since this drafting procedure constitutes a kind of before-the-fact “piano reduction,” it can shed light on Berg’s fundamental conception of the passage (an issue discussed further in Chapter 4). Berg did not follow this piano-sketch procedure for the extremities of the Präludium, nor for Reigen and the Marsch. In these cases, he generally sketched in pencil. His short-score draft required anywhere from 3- to 15-line systems, with 5-to-8-line systems typical.

Even in Particell, one is struck by the sheer density of the work. Figure 3.8 notes, for example, that the drafting of the mensural canon at the climax of the Präludium (m.36) required a 15-line system. Bear in mind that this is the short score! The same passage in the present edition of the full score requires 26 staves plus two single-line percussion staves. The multiplicity of distinct motive-bearing or collateral parts (approximately twenty) is therefore apparent: Berg’s Particell for this passage requires more than half the number of staves of its full orchestral realization! The situation for Reigen is
somewhat more conservative. The climax (m.66), 22 staves plus one percussion line in the full score, is drafted in an 8-line system in the Particell. And, though the marvellous orchestral block (from m.89) that reintroduces the Waltz (m.94) requires a 23rd system in score, its 8-line Particell draft is a model of economic clarity.

The Marsch, on the other hand, is of course generally thicker in texture than the other two pieces. Apart from its opening four measures, only the brief grazioso passage (mm.62-64) and the "grovel" of measures 78–80 could be drafted in three-stave systems. The Höhepunkt (m.126) required a rather messy 11-line system, the Flottes Zeitmass (m.136ff) a fairly clean 7-line system (since it is largely an orchestral effect rather than a moment of real multipart complexity, and Berg seems remarkably adept and efficient in laying out such passages); in the full score, their respective realizations require 28 staves (plus 4 percussion lines) and 24–26 staves (plus up to 4 percussion lines).

The brief description of Reigen shows that its gathering structure allowed for a more generous use of paper in the later sections. The Marsch, however, is regularly crammed. In several instances Berg had to balloon a space above the system in order to add to the draft. These balloons have two purposes. In the cases of mm.10–11 and mm.44–45 (perhaps, too, for mm.48–49), it would appear that Berg simply did not leave himself enough space in the initial sketch to allow for the proper placement of added 16th-note or 32nd-note figures. So, he ballooned them above the staff. Mm.34–35, m.38, m.96, and m.155 are a different matter. These are extra measures inserted into the draft to correct a compositional situation. Since proper assessment of such insertions requires an understanding of the musical context, discussion must be deferred until the Marsch chapter.
As noted in Figures 3.1 and 3.2, Berg's autograph score and the fair copy which he sent to Schoenberg are now in New York, part of the Robert Lehman and Mary Flagler Cary collections (respectively), housed at the Pierpont Morgan Library (US-NYpm; see also Chapter 2, note 64). Naturally, Berg made the fair copy for Schoenberg from his original score. Both items have been rebound for their current collections and, in any case, there is not much to be learned from the gathering structures. The red leather binding into which the Lehman collection autograph has been placed has "BERG 4 PIÈCES" [sic] embossed on its spine. The fair copy (also clearly rebound for collector Cary) bears the handwritten dedication to Schoenberg on its title page ("Meinem Lehrer und Freund / Arnold Schönberg / in unermeßlichen Dankbarkeit und Liebe") that one also finds in the 1923 edition, as well as the copyright and UE-plate-number information for that edition on the first page of score ("Copyright 1923" the "23" entered in pencil, and "Universal-Edition Nr 7396" entered in purple pencil).

The page layout and measure-disposition of the two documents is close to identical, again reflecting the fact that the one was copied from the other. (The one small exception is found in Reigen: Berg breaks the pages/systems at mm.96–100 and mm.101–104 in the autograph, more spaciously at mm.96–99 and the sparser mm.100–104 in the fair copy.) However, Berg often used pages with a couple of extra lines for the fair copy version so that it would have a less crowded appearance. The 'extra' folio in the fair copy (52 versus 51 leaves) is on account of the dedication page. The difference in the number of paper formats (as noted in Figures 3.1 and 3.2) is attributable to the fact that Berg, again for reasons of greater layout legibility, supplemented his usual supply of Eberle (J.E. & C°) manuscript paper with larger format Breitkopf & Härtel paper (type 46E 36-line for the climax of the Präludium and for
Apart from minor touching up, the fair copy itself was left unaltered after 1915, so that it could be used as the basis for the photoreproduction that became the 1923 edition. A set of page proofs (A-Wn F 21 Berg 142) for that edition, taken from the fair copy, contains the numerous minor revisions that were incorporated into that edition. Berg, however, entered some of these page-proof corrections, as well as other corrections made after the 1923 edition appeared, into his autograph score. (For example, the counting error in Reigen which resulted in the need for the insertion of measure number "452" in the 1923 edition is found in the page proofs, but not in the fair copy from which they were photoreproduced; nonetheless, Berg went back and entered the change in his retained personal copy, the autograph score.)

When, in 1929, Berg made more substantial editorial revisions to the score in preparation for its first complete performance, rather than continuing to make changes to his autograph, he took a copy of the 1923 edition and compiled all the changes into this one document (A-Wn F 21 Berg 141). This is the 'Fassung letzter Hand' for Opus 6. It served as the basis for the posthumous editorial work, chiefly under the supervision of Hans Erich Apostel, which culminated in the 1954 edition of the score. Berg's revised score (Berg 141) must serve as the starting point for a proper historical-critical edition of Opus 6 in Berg's Complete Works. My own investigations show that it is in several instances necessary to go back to items that preceded Berg 141: a number of minor errors had already occurred in the transfers from Particell to autograph score (for example, Reigen, clarinet transposition, m.105, discussed in Chapter 5, pp.259-261), and from autograph to fair copy (the source of the erroneous tempo marking, "TQ III" [recte TQ II]
at m.53 of the Marsch). Editorial decisions made on the basis of the Particell, the autograph score, fair copy, or first edition page proofs, and changes made later by Berg's editorial team, Apostel and the staff of Universal Edition would then be documented in the critical report.


We will comment on the circumstances surrounding some of the later documents in Chapter 6, where we survey the performance and publication history of Opus 6. For now, our march through the documents comes to a halt: the descriptions given in Figures 3.1–3.3, the commentaries immediately following, and the more detailed inventories of sketches and Particell terminate with the brief remarks on the autograph score and fair copy given above. More detailed consideration of the contents of selected sketches and Particell passages is undertaken in the chapters on the individual pieces which now follow.
4 Präludium: “composing between the tones”

Stravinsky referred to Berg’s Opus 6 Pieces (1913–1915) as “the perfect work ... the essential work, with Wozzeck, for the study of all of his music,” and he judged the Präludium, in particular, “the most perfect of these in conception and realization.” “The form rises and falls, and it is round and unrepeating. It begins and ends in percussion, and the first notes of the timpani are already thematic (Stravinsky, 1959, 73).”

The ‘roundness’ is a reference to the recurrence of certain opening materials towards the end of the piece. Aside from the structurally framing percussion work, this is most noticeable at mm.42–44 where, to employ Berg’s later-coined term for such phenomena, the ‘Hauptrhythmus’ (RH-) E-flats return with the same chordal succession as in mm.9–11.

The ‘unrepeating’ quality is, in part, a reference to the ‘Fortspinnung’ of the main tune (though in this motivically set-class-rich idiom ‘Fortespinnung’ might be more accurate). But it is also a reference to the subtlety of the roundness. Materials are reordered and recomposed. This fact poses challenges both to our documentary study of Berg’s compositional process and to our analytical study of how the piece hangs together. We begin at the broadest level with the formal outline of the Präludium which is provided in Figure 4.1:
Figure 4.1: Formal Outline of the Präludium

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Identifying Gestures (Instr., Themes, Sonorities)</th>
<th>Berg's Sketch</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Intro. additive impulses 1... 2... 3... etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>perc.: TT+cym+drums+timp. 4-22 [357A]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+fl hn. hp. strings 5-23 &lt;75A38&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>bassoon: H 3-3 [478] ref. sonority 1 A1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cells chords a b c</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>muted trumpet N 3-3 [236]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(alto) trombone: RH* on Eb5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Klangfarbenakkorde chs d e f</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>ff interjection 3-3 ∪ 3-3 = 5-37 A2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>chords g h i k</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RH* framing statement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>violin antecedent ‘main theme’ A3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H 3-3 &lt;478&gt; rotating basic idea</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>muted trumpet N 3-3 &lt;2363&gt; ref. sonority 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>antecedent chords a b c</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>fl. ob. continuation chords d e f</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>... sequential handling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>... fragmentation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>oboe: consequent ‘second idea’ Mitte H 3-3 &lt;8545&gt; inv. rotating b.i. ‘Anfang’ (ref. sonority 1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>vn. continuation ... sequential handling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>trumpet:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>climax: mensuration canon × d of 4-22 &lt;0A38&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>liquidation ... RH* in horns, intro. of cyclic motives ...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>sextuplets</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>= cyclic motives: α β γ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>retransition: ‘braking ostinato’ (includes A2) A4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>return: (fl bn.) RH* on Eb4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>... of Klangfarbenakkorde chords d e f</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>(Reigen ‘fore-echo’ = δ interpolation)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>(“Märchenhand chord”)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>return: (db.) H 3-3 [236]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>... of motivic cells chords c b a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(mtd tr.) H 3-3 [478]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>return: ... of percussion and ... ref. sonority 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>exit signature? BerG (timpani; +TT)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Formal Design

Figure 4.1 locates by measure various identifying gestures (instrumentation, thematic/motivic statements, important chordal sonorities) which characterize formal events in the Präludium. The right-hand column also gives Berg’s formal designations as found in the early sketches which we will discuss below.

Broadly speaking, the work consists of a tetrapartite introduction (mm.1-15), a main theme (mm.16-24), and an inversionally-derived second idea (m.25ff) which leads to a climax in m.36, the liquidation of which introduces ostensibly new motives which are significant to the Opus 6 cycle as a whole and which lead, by way of conclusion, to a reordered and recomposed return of materials from the introduction. We now continue with a more detailed description of these formal subdivisions as outlined in Figure 4.1.

The four parts of the Langsam introduction are: (1) the now famous ev nihilo percussion (mm.1-6), with its additive impulses and carefully managed timbral modulation from indefinite to definite pitch (the timpani’s set-class (SC) 4–22 [0247] [357A]); (2) the arrival of the chord that we will identify as the piece’s referential sonority, <75A38> SC 5–23 [02357], with the bassoon’s Ab and Hauptstimme (H–) cell 3–3 [014] as <478> (and the inversionally-derived Nebenstimme (N–) on muted trumpet <236>); (3) the Klangfarbenakkorde (mm.9–11; the significance of chord labels ‘a’ through ‘k’ in Figure 4.1 will be clarified shortly) with ‘Hauptrhythmus’ (RH–) high Eb’s for alto (originally) trombone, terminated by (4) a fortissimo interjection, the thematic component of which is derived from the union of two 3–3 cells (<965> and <541> as SC 5–37 [03458] [14569]) and which ends with a framing reiteration of the RH–.
With the return of the referential sonority (m.16) and the rotating repetition of cell 3–3 in the violins, we recognize the first real presentation of a main theme (Ein wenig bewegter (T° II)). The theme begins (mm.16–19) as if to form an antecedent phrase, with the repeated 3–3 basic idea ([014] as <4787>) flowering into a more extended complementary idea which reaches temporary caesura at m.19. The theme, however, does not form a consequent phrase but rather continues (mm.19–21 and 21–24) with a developmentally sequential and fragmented treatment of motives derived from the complementary idea.

At the end of m.24, the second idea takes over, initially in the manner of the consequent we expected earlier, the repeated 3–3 [014] idea (as oboe <8545>) now inversionally derived. Seemingly trapped in a rotation of the [014] cell, the idea breaks into its continuation and sequential fragmentation in the violins (mm.28–30) (Wieder bewegter). The trumpets then pick up the same idea (m.31) to begin a series of overlapping statements that culminate in the orchestral climax of m.36.

The climax features a mensuration canon which presents pitch-class string <0A83> (= opening SC 4–22 [0247]; the compositional rationale for this will be discussed later) in the five different note values shown in Fig. 4.1 while the horns (interior to the texture) recall the RH°. The liquidation of the climax introduces cyclic motives α, β, and γ. (These motives, along with δ at m.44, recur in the other Opus 6 pieces.) This interjection yields to a retransition: a 'braking ostinato' (E2–C#2) that is introduced by (and later incorporates imitatively) the fortissimo interjection motive from m.11.¹

Measure 42 brings a first level of return, where, as we noted at the beginning of the chapter, the Hauptrhythmus (RH°) E-flats return (now an octave lower, Eb4 in flute and bassoon rather than Eb5 on high trombone) with the same (though reorchestrated) chordal succession that occurred in
measures 9–11. An interpolation follows: this *tremolando* idea for violins and celesta is a ‘fore-echo’ of *Reigen* and also serves as cyclic motive $\delta$.

A second level of *return* occurs at m.49: the Hauptstimme ($H'$) 3–3 [014] motivic cells return on double bass <632> [236] and muted trumpet <874> [478]. The reversed order of these cells is complemented by the retrogression of their accompanying chords. With the *return* at m.51 of the first chord (the referential sonority of m.6), the opening percussion work also returns to frame the formal design as a whole.

In this brief overview of the formal design, we have noted the recurrence at important formal junctures of a particular chord, which we have designated the referential sonority of the piece ("I ref.sonority I" on Fig.4.1). Berg’s *Präludium* is one of many non-triad-tonal twentieth-century works, in various idioms, which posit a structurally referential sonority. In this chapter, I shall argue from analytical observations as well as from the evidence of the sketches that much of the voice-leading and motivic activity of the piece can be understood as a “composing between the tones” of the referential sonority.$^2$

The principal referential sonority here is SC 5–23 [02357] [75A.38], presented as a ‘gapped’ fourth-chord: $G2-(no\ C3)-F3-Bb3-Eb4-Ab4$. This is established in m.6 and returns conclusively in m.51. It also occurs at the beginning of the main theme (m.16) and, as we will subsequently show, in rather less obvious fashion at the beginning of the ‘second idea/middle section’ (mm.24–25) and at the climax (m.36).
More than just the referential sonority recurs. In an unpublished study, Bruce Archibald (1966, 90) revealed the fact, more recently expanded upon by Mark DeVoto (1980, 99–101), that five of the chords of mm.6–10 recur in mm.16–23. In addition to its being an astute analytical observation, this turns out to be a remarkable intuition of a documentary source.

**The Sketches and the opening chordal progression**

**Examples 4.1–4.4** are transcriptions from Vienna Stadtbibliothek [A–Wst] sketchbook MH 14.263/c. (A description of the source is found in Chapter 3, p.124.) **Example 4.1** (page 39 of the sketchbook) shows the chordal basis (differing somewhat from the final version) for mm.4–15 of the *Praeludium*, with chords labelled “a” through “k” (lines 1–2 and 4–5) and a rough sketch for the subsequent main theme (line 8; corresponding to mm.18–19 though differing in the final notes). Note the “Wogend (Echo)” beside chords a–b–c: the chords are indeed reiterated in wavy echoes in the score. In d–e–f we note the absence of the ‘Hauptrhythmus’ E-flats that sound against the progression in the score. And, extracted from chords g–h–i, we find the tentative beginnings of a descending chromatic line: Gb3–F3–E3.

This kind of sketch displays a compositional procedure closely modeled on the practice of writing block chordal progressions which is a feature of Schoenberg’s *Harmonielehre*. The procedure remained an important element in Berg’s compositional toolkit throughout his life. And, in the particular case of the *Praeludium*, the action of joining together a series of block chords through surface and more structural voice-leadings serves as the underlying organizational principal.
Example 4.1: Sketch of underlying chordal progression of Präludium
(Transcription of A-Wst MH 14.263/c, p.39)

Notes:
1. originally A½?
2. originally Eb
3. deleted
4. [b] supplied
5. stems only
6. Begleit[ung]?
George Perle cites Reigen, the Marsch and the passacaglia of the Altenberglieder ("Hier ist Friede," op. 4, no. 5) as evidence of Berg's discovery of "the essential role that traditional forms and traditional stylistic details could play in restoring the possibility of coherent large-scale structure which the dissolution of the classical tonal system had destroyed (Perle 1980 [1983], 150-151)." In this sketch (Ex.4.1), Berg's chords a–k form the potential basis for a chaconne (cf. Wozzeck, 1/2.) Page 34 of the same sketchbook (not transcribed here) shows a very rough rhythmic layout for mm.4–6 of these alphabet chords. Greater detail is found in our next two examples.

Examples 4.2 and 4.3 (pages 23 and 24 of the sketchbook) form a continuity sketch of Präludium mm.4–19. (Note: references will be to the measure numbers in square brackets on the transcription, which correspond to the score, and which must be distinguished from Berg's measure numbers as sketched.) The alphabetic designations "A1", "A2", and (in Ex.4.3) "A3" demonstrate Berg's working conception of the formal subdivisions.

"A1" is mm.4–11: the opening chords and the first 3–3 melodic motives; the opening percussion work is absent from the sketch. "A1" also includes the Klangfarbenakkorde and the distinctive alto trombone Hauptrhythmus Eb's (indicated by my editorial "RH"). "A2" is the compelling ff interjection (continued in Example 4.3).³ Line 1 of Example 4.3 forms an independent system—it explores the thematic inversion which characterizes m.24, the middle section/second idea of the score.⁴ Measure 14 is missing in the sketch—in Particell and score, Berg works in a framing reiteration of the RH. "A3" is Berg's designation for the beginning of the Main Theme (cf. my Fig.4.1); it is clearly present in line 7—the accompanying chords, are, once again, chords a–b–c, the chords of the opening.
Example 4.2: Continuity sketch of opening of Präludium, mm.4–11
(Transcription of A-Wst MH 14.263/c, p.23)

Notes:
1 notes deleted but legible
2 passage deleted; not very legible
3 illegible; imitation of 2
4 motive deleted
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One looks in vain, however, for the continuation of the main theme on the next pages of the sketchbook (see Example 4.4 on the preceding page). The sketches seem suddenly to have shifted to a more formal-conceptual level. Note the “A4” in the upper left-hand corner. This should, one would think, be a continuation of “A3”; but the only recognizable elements are: the bass motive (line 4) which is developed from the earlier idea designated “A2,” the ensuing ostinato E–C#, and the imitation (line 1) of “A2” set up by the dotted pickup rhythms. These ideas correspond to mm.39–41 of the score.

This is a long way from the beginning of the main theme (mm.16–19). And yet the juxtaposition of the two ideas in the sketch seems to confirm a longer formal reality—and the composer’s telescopic ear; namely, that, despite the inversionally-derived ‘second idea’ of mm.24–25ff and the major climax in m.36, the whole passage from m.16 through m.39 is only stopped by the ‘braking ostinato’ which concludes Berg’s “A4”. Furthermore, as we shall see below in a more detailed discussion of mm.16–24, the progression of chords a–b–c which underlies the opening of the main theme (mm.16–19) does not continue directly with chords d–e–f at their original pitch level (in mm.20–24); the chords, for structural voice-leading purposes we shall uncover, are transposed. Progression d–e–f returns at its original pitch level only at m.42 of the score; namely, in that passage which follows directly upon “A4” as sketched. Hence, Berg’s sketch cuts directly from “A3”, the chords a–b–c under the main theme, to “A4” the retransition which, in the score, sets up the return of chords d–e–f at their original pitch level.

(The designations “B Scherzo”, “C Adagio”, and “D A Finale / DZ” in the transcription relate to Berg’s plan for a four-movements-in-one-movement Symphony, modelled on Schoenberg’s Chamber Symphony, to which he refers in a letter of 09–07–1913. It was shown in Chapter 2, pp.61–62, that Berg originally conceived these Präludium sketches as the opening
section of that Symphony; the transformation of this material from Symphony to Präludium is confirmed in Berg’s letter to his wife, 14-07-1914.

This concludes our survey of the most important sketches for the Präludium. We will have occasion shortly to return to a few of the details of these sketches as corroborating support for analytical interpretation of the principal structural motion of the opening measures. We move now to Berg’s Particell.

The Particell and the opening chordal progression

Example 4.5 transcribes (in two pages) the opening page (mm.1–14) of Berg’s autograph Particell [A-Wn F 21 Berg 12, fol.2]. (The Particell was described in Chapter 3, pp.142–148.) We will deal with this two-page Example only quite briefly now but will refer the reader to it several times later on. Differences between this short score and the orchestral score often provide an intriguing view of what Berg regarded as the basic content of a passage. As a simple case in point, consider the famous opening percussion work. Noticeably absent from the A-Wst sketches, the percussion prologue is also considerably simpler in the Particell than it is in the score. In the Particell, the additive nature of the passage is entirely apparent: 1 impulse, then 2 impulses, then 3; add pitch content (actually four pitches); 4 impulses; expand the registral space of the pitch content; 5 impulses; five-note referential chord. The “edges” of this design are beautifully softened in the final score, like a charcoal drawing whose basic linearity has been rubbed and shaded away.
Example 4.5: Transcription of Berg's Particell, mm.1-7
(A-Wn F 21 Berg 12, fol.2, top half)
Example 4.5 (cont'd): Transcription of Berg's Particell, mm.8–14
(A-Wn F 21 Berg 12, fol.2, bottom half)
This additive procedure is then taken over by the bassoon in m.6—one note, two notes, to the basic 3–3 [014] motives of m.8. As Example 4.6 (below) summarizes, the 014 motive, once it has arrived, goes on to permeate the texture of mm.6–16: in the trumpet Nebenmotive (m.8), in the voice-leading of the Klangfarbenakkorde (horn and clarinets, mm.9–10), in the ff interjection (mm.11–13); and even in the cello and horn upbeat gestures (mm.15–16), each of which effects an interlocking statement of two 014 cells as a means of reintroducing the G2 and Bb3, respectively, of the returning referential sonority.

Example 4.6: 3–3 [014] motivic cells, mm.6–16

Example 4.7: order of introduction of pcs
Example 4.7 (on the previous page) shows that the order of introduction of pitch classes in these opening measures closely corresponds to the cycle of fourths (ic5): chord 'a' contains the cycle from G through Ab, but omits C; chord 'b' adds C# through B (retaining Eb and Ab from 'a'); chord 'c', at mm.7-8, adds E and D (retaining F# and B from chord 'b'; and reinstating Bb from chord 'a', in what we shall find is a significant registral transfer); chord 'd' adds A in the subsequent exchange of the registers of notes E and D from chord 'c'. At this point, m.9, the remaining pitch-class, C, which has been "due" for some time—in fact, since the opening chord—is placed in the upper register in association with the initial bass note G of chord 'a', and with the bass note C#/Db of chord 'b'.

In the Harmonielehre chapter on chords constructed in fourths Schoenberg observes: "the construction of chords by superimposing fourths can lead to a chord that contains all the twelve tones of the chromatic scale; hence, such construction does manifest a possibility for dealing systematically with those harmonic phenomena that already exist in the works of some of us: seven, eight, nine, ten, eleven, and twelve-part chords." He goes on to say that "on occasion tones may be omitted" from the cycle.

Schoenberg, in his theory text, is considering fourth chords as extensions, "a rounding out", as he puts it, of the tertian system. But, in quoting his Pelleas und Melisande and Chamber Symphony, he states that the fourth chords "do not appear here merely as melody or as a purely impressionistic chord effect; their character permeates the total harmonic structure, and they are chords like all others."9

This hint that such chords might have independent status, coupled with the fact of Berg's intimate knowledge of both the Harmonielehre and the Chamber Symphony makes the choice of the referential sonority for the Präludium an apparent act of homage. Example 4.8(a) is taken from Berg's
thematic analysis of the Chamber Symphony. Done in 1913–14, at the same time he began composition of the Opus 6 pieces, it should be compared with Example 4.8(b), the referential chord of the Präludium. Save the initially missing C—“on occasion tones may be omitted,” said Schoenberg—the chords are identical! (Example 4.8(c) extends the comparison to the referential sonority of Schoenberg’s op.16, no.3; we will return to this subject later.)

Example 4.8: Berg’s choice of referential sonority

Figure 4.2 (see next page) examines the sonority characteristics and pitch-class relations of Berg’s opening chordal progression more closely: pitch-class sets ‘A’ through ‘K’ correspond to sketched chords ‘a’ through ‘k’ in the somewhat revised form found in Berg’s Particell (and score). For convenience of reference, Sets A through K, as well as set P=the opening timpani collection, are also labelled [in editorial square brackets] in Example 4.5, above, the transcription of the opening of the Particell.
Figure 4.2:  Pc-set structure of the chordal progression of the Introduction

m.3  P=4-22 [0247] [357A]

m.6  A=5-23 [02357] <75A38>
    B=4-22 [0247] <16B3>
      B+H'=5-35 <16B3+8>
    C=5-30 [01468] <26BA>
      C+H'=6-31 [014579] [246AB+7]
      6-34 [013579] [246AB+8]
      +N'  7-30 [0124689] [26AB+38]

m.9  D=6-47 [012479] <294170>
    D+RH'=7-12 [012479] [294170+2]
    E=5-20 [01568] <A38Z>
      E+RH'=same, 5-20 includes [2]
    F=4-20 [0158] <07B4>
      F+RH'=5-21 [01458] [07B4+2]

m.11 G=6-33 [023579] <1705A2>
    G+H'=7-29 [0124679] [1705A3+6]
    7-34 [013468A] [1705A3+9]
    H=5-31 [01369] <392690>
    H+H'=6-27 [013469] [392690+5]
    6-45 [023469] [392690+4]
    I=5-14 [01257] [5A358A+1]
    I+H'=4-23 [0257] <5A358A>
    K=5-35 [02479] <84691>
      K+some 'Nn'* details before K is recovered=>
      5-30 [01468] [B5691] which embeds
      4-22 [0247] <B691> briefly as pc4 is displaced by pc5;
      4-28 [0369] <A471> (m.13, last eighth)
      6-29 [023679] [01457A] (m.14, within first eighth)

m.14 K=5-35 [02479] <B4691> recovered in framing statement of RH'.

Notes: The addition of Hauptstimme, Nebenstimme, and Hauptrhythmus pitches results in ancillary chordal collections; these are indented below the entries for the main chords. The underscored pitch-classes show those tones retained in the immediately following chord. For example: the opening timpani collection, P=4-22 [0247] [357A], is entirely retained in the referential sonority, chord 'a', A=5-23 [02357] <75A38>; chord 'b' is also set-class 4-22, but only pc 3 is retained between A and B. Annotations to the right in parentheses show significant/characteristic (though not exhaustive) embeddings for some of the chords, including Tn/TnI transforms for embeddings of P=4-22. The expression "emb 4-23(2)" means that there are two instances of the collection 4-23 embedded in the prevailing sonority. SC 4-23 [0257] is the 'ungapped fourth-chord' tetrachord (cf. P= 4-22, 'gapped'). Tetrachordal subsets of chords E and F in combination with 'Hauptrhythmus' tone Eb—4-17 [0348], 4-19 [0148] and 4-20 [0158]—produce the beautifully cloying mix of major-minor seventh-chord sonorities in mm.9-11.

Nn*='neighbour-note'; i.e., adjacencies.
From Figure 4.2, it is easily seen that timpani collection ‘P', as SC 4-22 \[0247\] forms an important embedded sonority in chords ‘A, B, C, D, G, and K’. Beyond the total embedding of ‘P' in ‘A', however, values for n under \(T_n/T_{nI}\) applied to ‘P’, viewed in this abstract manner, do not reveal any predetermined pattern. Nevertheless, it will be noted that chord ‘G', which begins the second half of the introduction (Berg's section “A2’’), by embedding \(T_0P\), recovers the level of P as it appeared in referential sonority ‘A’; and that ‘K’, which concludes the introduction, employs embeddings of 4-22 (\(T_6P\) and \(T_4IP\)) which contain no pcs in common with the original level of ‘P’.

The referential sonority itself, \(<75A38>\), is a quartal disposition of the major-scale pentachord. As SC 5-23 \[02357\], it embeds six of the twelve trichordal SCs, significantly not among them: 3-1 [012], 3-3 [014], and 3-5 [016]. These absences allow: the [012] chromatic trichord to perform articulating wedge functions into sonority members, the [014] trichord to function against the sonority as the generative melodic motive of the piece, and the [016] trichord to function as the alternative to the ‘purely quartal’ component of the sonority and the associated harmonies in chords C, D, E, G, and H.

Addition of the “missing” C3 to the referential sonority would, of course, produce a chain of five perfect fourths; i.e., the major diatonic hexachord, SC 6-32 \[024579\]; the recovery of the C as a missing pitch-class figures significantly in the climax of the piece (m.36). SC 6-32 embeds 4-22 a remarkable four times (and 4-23 [0257] the complete ‘fourth-chord’ tetrachord three times); it also twice embeds the referential 5-23 as well as the pentatonic 5-35 [02479]. This is significant because the potential 6-32, as \(<7[0]5A38>\), covers the initial referential sonority in m.6; and its potential complement, as \([16B49[2]]\), covers the 5–35 that is chord ‘K’: this use of 5–23 and 5–35 as representative subsets of a pair of complementary 6-32s helps to provide the
introduction with a sense of (aggregate) completion and prepares the return of the referential sonority at the beginning of the main theme.

**Structural Voice-Leading of the Introduction and ...**

We move now to a consideration of the structural voice-leading of the introduction. We shall first describe that voice-leading in this subsection; then, in the two subsections that follow, we will examine it in the light of Berg's sketches, and from the perspective of his use of Schoenberg's op.16, no.3 as a compositional model.

Even the most skeptical critic of 'atonal voice leading' would find it hard to deny that Berg has extracted the motion Gb(or F#)-F-E from sketched chords g-h-i (recall sketch transcription, Example 4.1, above) and has embellished this motion through the union of two 3-3 motives (<6965> U <511>; as SC 5-37 [03458]) to produce the ff thematic interjection of his "A2" section, mm.11-13. What precedes and what follows this F#3-F3-E3 motion is described in the next three paragraphs. The reader may wish to follow this description with reference to the transcription of the Particell given in Example 4.5, above; chords 'P' and 'A' through 'K' are labelled on the transcription with editorial square brackets.

Between timpani chord 'P' (m.4) and referential sonority 'A' (m.6), Berg shifts the fourth Bb2-Eb3 up an octave to Bb3-Eb4, suggesting very early in the piece that registral manipulation will play an important role. Perhaps this is in part what Stravinsky meant when he observed that: "the first notes of the timpani are already thematic (1959, 73)." Referential sonority 'A' unquestionably has Ab4 as its top voice, articulated by the bassoon's developing 3-3 <478> Hauptmotive. What happens to this Ab? Clearly retained in chords 'B' and 'C' (mm.7-8), are we to understand that the Ab at the same time moves up to Bb4 in chord 'C', and to C5 (perhaps even to the
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measure [8] of Example 4.2, Berg’s sketch shows a deleted but reasonably legible passage which does not appear in the score, possibly because it is too rhythmically active (perhaps a premonition of the sextuplets in m.37?). Similarly “superfluous” workings of the main melodic cell appear in sketch line 10 [m.10] as framing echoes to Berg’s section “A1”. In the score, these do not occur—rather, the trombone Eb with its accompanying Klangfarben-akkorde is allowed to burnish forth unsullied by motivic rumblings.

Nonetheless, these “extra” motivics do seem—as it were, at the moment of conception—to be intuitive confirmation of my suggested understanding of the structural motion: the motivic echoes from m.[9] (E to Ab3), and in m.[10] (D–Eb to G3) support the idea that the initial structural upper-voice motion is Ab4–G4 and that the G is transferred down an octave in m.10 to a G3 introduced (at least in the sketch) by similar motivic actions.

Further, in the sketch (Ex.4.3), the ff interjection of Berg’s “A2” section—which I have argued continues from G3 through Gb/F# and F to E—is given an extra diminution by Berg: he repeats the Gb–F eighth notes (m.[12], beat 4), thus taking an “extra run” at the E. Additional documentary corroboration for this analytical reading may be gleaned from Berg’s Particelli (Ex.4.5, second page, mm.12–13): we note the careful articulations at this point, the tenuto markings which move the embellished F#3 through F and E. And, against modern practices of editorial uniformity, we see that Berg’s hairpin crescendo on the E3—which in the published score has been flattened out and extended to the staccato-dotted C#—seems here to provide a flare of confirmation to voice-leading importance of the E.

Returning once again to the sketch (Ex.4.3, line 3), we find that this E3 is noticeably abandoned in m.13. Indeed, Berg could have been no more clear in confirming that the E3 of m.13 is only picked up an octave higher by the returning E–G–Ab 3–3 motive: he drops the C# to the lower staff (as it were,
to a lower inner voice; [the dotted line is editorial]), thereby leaving nothing between the two E's on sketch-line 3. Berg is also careful to show how the E4 (end of line 3) is returned to the inner-voice Eb4 in m.16 (line 7): he places a downward-stemmed half-note E[b] under the beginning of "A3", the Ab–G of the main theme, even though he already has that Eb present in the sketch on line 9, as a member of a chord—the returning referential sonority.

I do not, of course, wish to imply that Berg "got it better" in the sketch than in the score. On the contrary, I think the voice-leading of the score is ultimately clearer and, at the same time, more beautifully-formed and subtle. But, it is in just this kind of sketch—a composer's first intuitive hearing of the general shape and motion of a passage—that we can sometimes find traces not only of how the ideas associate with each other but of how they move and cumulatively connect.

... and Schoenberg as a compositional model

I have already documented (in Ex.4.8, above) Berg's indebtedness to Schoenberg's Chamber Symphony and to the Harmonielehre discussion of fourth chords in his choice of the referential sonority of the Präludium. I have also documented Berg's original intention (09-07-1913) to form a one-movement symphony along the lines of Schoenberg's Chamber Symphony (recall sketch Ex.4.4). One month later (16-08-13) Berg reports slow progress on the Symphony; the next month (10-09-13) Berg tells Schoenberg that he is studying the Opus 16 Orchestra Pieces, which had recently appeared in Webern's two-piano reduction.

Berg's analytically annotated copy of the reduction and a single manuscript sheet which pertains exclusively to op. 16, no. 3 are found in the Nachlaß (A-Wn F 21 Berg 155). The separate sheet shows that Berg was aware
of the 13 vertical statements of the five-tone chord and of the use of a motivic 'wedge' beginning with inner-voice 2, E–F–Eb, as a means of connection; Berg also seeks to determine the structural duration (in measures) of each chord and applies an approximate 8:1 reduction to the upper-voice tone of each chord which renders the forty-four measures in six.

All commentators have noted affinities between Berg's Präludium and Schoenberg's op.16, no.3. In general, attention is limited to the "colouristic," proto-minimal qualities in both works. In the Präludium, this is accomplished by the opening percussion work, and by what Stravinsky described as "one of the noblest sounds Berg or anyone else ever caused to be heard in an orchestra" (Stravinsky, 1959, 73)—the 'Hauptthrythmus' on high Eb (originally for alto trombone) with its accompanying Klangfarbenakkorde. Schoenberg's piece is, of course, the locus classicus of Klangfarbentechnik. Its famous chord is given at the beginning of Example 4.9(a): the fourth chord component is obviously similar to the Opus 6 chord; the augmented triad component is not a feature of the Opus 6 chord. (This comparison between the chords was summarily illustrated in Example 4.8(c) above.)

As is conventionally well established (see Example 4.9(a)), the initial referential chord 'X' of Schoenberg's piece passes through its $T_2X$ minimally invariant statement at m.15 [= m.235 of the score] to its $T_4X$ maximally invariant goal at m.24 [= m.244], returning via a remarkable orchestral shimmy to the original pitch level (m.30 [=m.250]). The motion within these main structural points is accomplished by means of a canonic "wedge" motive (see the <9A8> in the top voice of the Example) in the five-voice "firing order" (Rahn 1980, 62) 2–1–4–5–3. (The voices are numbered on Ex.4.9(a), though only the upper voice of the canon is shown.) However, the B4 at $T_2X$ is not merely the 'minimally-invariant surviving common tone' between the two statements of the chord: the pitch has actually been
between the two statements of the chord: the pitch has actually been transferred from the bass to the top voice. The wedge motive continues there, just as it would have done had it continued in the bass register. See the arrow on Example 4.9(b). (Examples 4.9(c) and (d) have been aligned below 4.9(a) and (b) for the purpose of illustrating comparisons between the Schoenberg and Berg pieces that we will discuss in detail a bit further on.)

Example 4.9: Berg and Schoenberg, a comparison of structural voice-leading in Schoenberg’s op.16, no.3 and in Berg’s Präludium introduction.
While it is generally agreed that the bass D, similarly the following E, form “anticipations” of their upcoming chords, an analytical explanation for the delayed arrival of top-note B in T2X has been elusive—the B pops up only well after the Ab has moved down to Gb/F#. A particularly useful solution to this problem is advocated here: the B “stays out of the way” until the Ab makes its motion to an “inner voice,” an important structural motion that will continue throughout the piece; only after this “motion to an inner voice” has taken place does the B, immediately echoed an octave higher on piccolo and celesta, pop up from the bass voice; perhaps—one might hazard to say—like a bubble, popping to the surface on a “Summer Morning by a Lake.”

Example 4.9(b) shows a structural voice-leading interpretation (after Laufer 1986) for this stratum of the work. Note how the bass tone Db, which would be due if the canon were strictly restated, is similarly transferred to the upper voice. Indeed, both the Eb and the Db, suppressed in the structurally passing bass, occur in the goal chord (notated as C# and D#) the two ‘new’ pitch-classes of the T4X, the other three pcs forming its maximally invariant augmented triad component. From this goal, the return to the original pitch level is, in part, accomplished by a dovetailing of the wedge motives. This feature is acknowledged in Berg’s analytical notes through the use of interlocking brackets. The dovetailing is shown here for the upper voice only; the inner voice, shown by the broken beams, continues its motion down to the B3 of the returning referential sonority. The asterisks [*] on the Example mark the first eight of the thirteen chords identified by Berg. (The remaining five chords constitute the double-neighbouring turn decoration about T0X which closes the piece.) Berg’s metric-reductive analysis acknowledges the delayed arrival of the top note of the third chord by decorating the B4 with a grace note!
As the reader can no doubt anticipate, I am about to point out some strikingly similar procedures in Berg's *Praeludium*. But first, we must return to a more detailed discussion of the voice-leading structure of mm.4–16. We begin that discussion with Example 4.9(d): notice how the component trichords of the referential sonority, interior fourth-chord F–Bb–Eb (circled) and the lower register G–C–C# [boxed]—the presence of the latter, due to the 'missing' C, at first only potential—provide continuity by recurring as trichordal SCs [027] and [016] respectively, throughout mm.4–16 as components of the associated harmonies. More fundamental to our discussion has been the motion of the structural upper voice from Ab to Eb (shown here for clarity in a single register), a composing between the tones of the referential sonority.

More detailed examination reveals that the other voices also compose between the tones of the referential sonority. It is important to stress that—since we know the referential sonority occurs in m.6 and returns in m.16—a 'composing between the tones' has the potential to be a merely trivial demonstration: after all, the tones have to get back somehow! What is important is the way in which they do so, the way the motivic details and associated harmonies combine to organize the process. The associative harmonies were emphasized in Example 4.9(d). Example 4.10 provides a more detailed analytical sketch of the voice-leading structure of mm.4–16 showing the motivic basis of the motion of the individual voices. A "Reading Guide" to the separate lines of Example 4.10 is provided in outline form as Figure 4.3.
Example 4.10: Detailed reading of voice-leading and motivic structure of Präludium introduction, mm.4–16.
Figure 4.3  Reading Guide to Individual Lines of Example 4.10.

upper voice: \( \text{Ab(m.6)} \text{ G(m.9)} \text{ F#–F–E (mm.11–13)} \text{ Eb (m.16)} \)

bass: \( \text{G/C# [F#]} \text{ E D; Db(assoc. son.) Eb F/B [F#] G} \)

from bass: \( \text{G (upwards) ...} \)
with beautiful tonalizing caesura at C ... to F!

from [C]: \( \text{C# to E; and Eb to C} \)
These third motions and the adjacency motion C–C# later establish themselves as motivic: see, for example, bassline E–Eb–D–C# (mm.19–20); baritone voice C2–Db–Eb (mm.20–21) and C#2–D–E (mm.22–23); bassline Eb–Db–C (mm.30–31) and C#–E (m.33); most explicitly in the violins C5–Bb4–Eb4 to C#–B–E (m.32); and E2–C#2 in the ‘braking ostinato’ (mm.40–41) answered by C2–Eb2 (horn 6) at m.47.

from F: \( \text{F F# adjacency} \)
Ab–G upper-voice motion kept alive in m.10; Ab–G and Ab–B (clarients) collectively yield 3–3

from Bb: \( \text{Bb B adjacency} \)
Db to E (imitates C# to E, in lower voice)
E4 eventually to Eb3 of referential sonority

Even the upper voice of the accompanying line in mm.11–13, *Eb3–C–Bb–A, is eventually returned to the Eb–Bb fourth of the referential sonority; the line itself is a transposition (an imitation in fact) of the structural bass motion, *G–E–D–Db, of mm.6–11 (both form set-class 4–13 [0136]; see the asterisks [*] on the Example.

The main aspects of this structural voice-leading can now be appreciated in the more compressed form shown in Example 4.9(c), above. A comparison of Example 4.9(c) with the Schoenberg Example 4.9(b) aligned above it shows that some remarkable similarities exist between the voice-leading structure of Berg’s introduction and that of Schoenberg’s piece. These similarities are summarized at the right of the two examples.
Although in Opus 16 this type of composing between the tones extends over the whole piece, in Opus 6 Berg’s procedure is most similar to Schoenberg’s only in its introductory measures (mm.6–16). In the Schoenberg piece, the fourth-chord component of the referential sonority is composed down through the seventh A to B; Berg composes up through the seventh G to F. The third (or tenth) component of the referential sonority is composed, with ‘passing tone’, in the bass register of both works.

Each piece employs motives that are distinct from the work’s chordal scaffolding; these motives act as aids to aural transit and as structural markers; the ‘superimposed fifths’ and ‘leaping trout’ strata of Opus 16, the various [014] cells in Opus 6. Schoenberg generates the structural motion through the canonic wedge motive and through transposition of the referential sonority. And it is intriguing to note that Schoenberg’s referential sonority SC 5–17 [01348] is the Z-related pair of (shares the same interval content vector <212320> with) SC 5–37 [02458]: the latter is represented in Berg’s [014]-linking “A2” thematic interjection <696541>. (Later, we shall also find that SC 5–17 itself, in a tertial voicing, is the lower pentachord of the referential sonority in Reigen.)

Berg does not employ Schoenberg’s canonic device, nor his transpositional manipulation of the referential chord, in the course of the structural voice-leading motion from Ab-to-Eb that governs the Präludium introduction. Later in the piece, however, we shall find that Berg does transpose his chaconne-like chordal progression, that he subjects the referential sonority to redisposition and registral manipulation, and that he marks the climax of the piece with a remarkable mensural canon.
The remainder of this chapter is devoted to analytical discussion of the subsequent sections of the Präludium: the main theme, the second idea, and the sections from the climax to the end. We will continue to draw upon Berg’s Particell for guidance as to the core contents; and we will employ pitch-class set and structural voice-leading perspectives in order to see how the 'composing between the tones procedure' continues to develop.

The Main Theme

Example 4.11 provides a reduction for analytical purposes of mm.15-25. (The reduction consists, for the most part, of the Hauptstimme and the underlying chordal basis of the passage.) Certainly the most striking aspect of these measures is the presence of a real "theme" with features of traditional formal function: the presentation of a basic idea (b.i.), cell [014] as <4787>(m.15-16), followed by its rotating repetition <8747>(m.16-17), which then blossoms into a registrally expansive contrasting (or complementary) idea (c.i.) <87 35A1 97 3B6 A8>(m.17-18) that ends in a temporary caesura (*) on the dyad Bb–Ab (at m.19), as if to end an antecedent phrase.

The tune seems 'draped' over its accompaniment, an accompaniment that turns out to be, in part, a chaconne-like repeat of the opening chordal progression: referential chord A at m.16, chord B at m.18, and chord C at m.19 (the letters are marked on Ex.4.11). Then chord C, to introduce one of Mark DeVoto’s coinages, “creeps” chromatically downward (DeVoto 1991; also DeVoto 1980, 101, where this passage is shown). Specifically, chord C, as E2–D3–F#3–B3–Bb4 (C=<426BA>) in m.19, becomes <315A8[not9]>, and in m.20, <20498> and <1B387>. Note that once the appoggiatura-like Bb4 ‘resolves’ to Ab4 in m.19, this Ab is retained throughout the creeping process; the Ab moves to G3 only with the entrance of chord D, m.20, beat 3.
Example 4.11: Main Theme, mm.15–25, analytical reduction

M.T. presentation (quasi antecedent)

A ref.son.

continuation

frag.

S.T. * [014]

D₄
The textured writing—or, perhaps better, writhing—within these chords was deemed too distracting to be incorporated into Example 4.11, but it is exemplified in the score by the warp of trichordal cells (principally 3–3 [014] and 3–5 [016]) and the woof of snakelike weavings heard in the first horn part beginning at m.16 (particularly mm.18–20). Notwithstanding the large incidence of adjacencies to ‘chord tones’ (for example, the apparent 3–4 [015] cells in the cellos result from the neighbour-note decoration of the major-third component of creeping chord ‘C’), this decorative procedure also constitutes a ‘composing between’—or at least around!—the tones of the basic chords.

Structurally more important, however (and therefore shown in Ex.4.11), is the fact that the trilling chord ‘D’ at m.20, beat 3, is transposed at $T_3D <5074A3>$ from its initial occurrence in m.9 ($T_0D, 6–47 [012479], <294170>$), and again, via varied sequential repetition, at $T_4D <6185B4>$ in m.22. (Similar transpositions of chord E and a slightly-altered chord F’ also follow each statement of chord D in model and sequence). By means of this sequential transposition Berg moves the upper voice of chord D between referential-chord pitch-classes Eb (m.20) and F (m.23) through E natural (mm.21 and 22).

Structural motion of the upper voice. Overall, this structural upper-voice motion of the main theme is marked by a series of “appoggiatura-like” dyads, indicated by the asterisks [*] in Ex.4.11. The structural motion may be summarized as follows: the upper voice begins with the dyad Ab4–G4 in m.16 and passes through the registrally displaced A5–G5 of m.18 to the Bb4–Ab4 of mm.19–20. In m.20, via $T_3D$, the formerly inner-voice Eb4 is laid above Bb to become dyad Eb5–Db5, and in m.21 the Eb5 is moved to E, the latter marked by the $\text{\textit{\textbullet}}$ tag. A varied sequence via $T_4D$ in m.22 takes dyad E5–D5 to F5, also marked with the tag (in m.23). (Note that the more passing
nature of the E-natural is confirmed by the presence of Eb4, rather than the more mechanically sequential E-natural on the downbeat of m.23.) Further ascent from F5 to F#5 is accomplished by fragmentation of the concluding \( \text{\textfrac{7}{4}} \) tag of the sequential figure. However, there is no time for a G5 to arrive: it is displaced by the Ab5 which—an octave above the structural pitch that began the main theme in m.16—now begins the second theme with an inversionally-derived rotating 3–3 [014] motive, as \(<8545>\).

In general, transpositions of associated harmonies (here chords D, E, and F) and structural-chromatic motions in the upper voice serve to move the tones of the referential sonority to new points of arrival. If, as I have shown earlier, the main motion of the upper voice in the introduction can be understood as a chromatic descent between the tones Ab4 and Eb4 of the referential sonority, the structural motion of the main theme can be understood as a series of registral transfers from the inner voices of that sonority: a structural motion from Ab4, through Bb4, Eb5 and F5, to Ab5. And we will find a subsequent ascent, over the course of the second theme, from Ab5 to the climactic C6 (with C7 doubling) of m.36.

The general view of Berg as the 'melodist' of the New Viennese triumvirate seems borne out by the preceding interpretation of the structure of the main theme. Though, as seems always the case with Berg, the most obvious facet of a passage—here dominance of the melodic voice—must not be accepted too quickly as the chief means of structural integrity. As we have seen in the case of this main theme, the melody is draped over a none-too-obvious repetition of the harmonic progression of the introduction.

**Bass voice.** Interpretation of the bass voice seems altogether more problematic throughout the Präludium. As Example 4.11 shows: the G2 of chord A is decorated with neighbouring F#; the C#3 of chord B appears (as in the introduction) as a kind of inner-voice motion. The E2 of chord C creeps,
in a quasi 'leaping passing tone' motion, down to C#2 before moving to F2. Together, the main pcs, E–C#–F, are perhaps motivic, forming SC [014] as <415>. Similarly, the sequential continuation of this bass motion to F#2 may be intended to combine SCs [014] and [016] as <521> and <106>. In both cases, the motion from chords T3D and T4D to similarly-transposed chords E and F form inner-voice motions—specifically the same C–Eb and C#–E motives which we cited in our discussion of the introduction. Finally, in mm.23–24, the dotted tag of the sequential idea is expressed in the lowest register, where it is clear that E2 passes through F3 and F#3 to G3. This forms a nested compression of the main embellishing-third motion of the bass voice, E–F–F#–[E F F# G]G, which, in turn, may function as a broad enlargement of the E–G third in the main theme incipit; the tenth E2–G3 then moves to F2–Ab3 at the beginning of the second theme.

Motivic pitch-class-set structure. Example 4.11 also shows selected details of the pc-set structure for the main theme. The tune begins with the repeated 3–3 [014] <4787> Hauptmotive as basic idea (b.i.). Note the continuing counterpointed presence of Nebenmotive 3–3 [014] <2363>. In a remarkably direct correspondence of harmonic and melodic materials, the pcs of referential sonority A are 'horizontalized' at the beginning of the complementary idea (c.i., m.18), i.e., SC 5–23 [02357] as <8735A>, though the harmony has changed at this point to chord B.

Taken mechanically, the next four notes of the tune form the gapped whole-tone collection SC 4–25 [0268] <1973>; and the final five notes of the phrase form 5–27 [01358] <3B6A8>. This segmentation corresponds to Berg's bowings and articulations. Even so, since I have argued that the purpose of the A5–G5 (in pcs <97>) dyad is to form a registrally displaced passing motion between Ab4–G4 and Bb4–Ab4, it is more important to recognize that the remaining melodic notes <1(97)3B6> also form a horizontalization of their
accompanying chord, chord B as <16B3>. Other notable details in this c.i. phrase include: the first two beats of m.18 which form 4–22 [0247] <35A1>; and the balancing 4–11 [0135] set-classes which begin (<8735>) and end (<B6A8>) the whole phrase.

In the connective links into the second (m.20) and third (m.22) phrases, respectively, the violins submerge beneath, and emerge as, the Hauptstimme: both instances form the same pc set as <A987=4A> (the last three pitches in the violins’ arpeggiated triple stop) and <789A4> (SC 5–4 [01236]), and are essentially chromatic motions, in opposite direction, to the same appended tritone. Phrase two, in oboes and flutes (mm.20–21), forms SC 5–29 [01368] as <8A311A431444>: the first four notes form 4–23 [0257], the underlined group 4–13 [0136], and the tag is 3–2 [013]. Again, in a remarkable horizontal-vertical correspondence, the trilling portion of accompanying chord T3D also forms 5–29 <5071Ax As doubled by trumpet, phrase three (mm.22–23), which re-emerges in the violins, begins with 4–16 [0157] <9A42> as a chromatic transformation of the 4–23 subset <8A31> which began phrase two.

Perhaps more directly, phrase three also features the rapid succession of two ‘gapped’ wholetone trichords, 3–8 [026] <A42> and <B15>, and a chromatic transformation of the 3–2 tag [013] <32555>. (The tetrachordal succession 4–15 [0146] <A42B>, 4–2 [0124] <1532555> seems quite secondary.) The fragmentary conclusion of the main theme hangs on the chromatic ascent of the 4–19 [0148] harmonies extracted from chord F'—<4B37>, <5048>, <6159>, and <726A>: this leads directly to the second thematic idea of the piece.

The end of Example 4.11 shows the beginning of the ‘second idea’. This important formal subdivision is marked by the concealed recurrence of the referential sonority. In the Example, members of the referential sonority are shown in wholenotes. Context establishes the appoggiatura-like character of
the E5 and B4 in the upper voices which sound against the bass F. The E moves to F on beat 2; the B moves not up to C but down to Bb on beat 4.

Though the combination of bass tone and accompanying chord (a typical left-hand piano configuration in its Particell form) effects a conventional tertial construction (an 'F-minor minor seventh chord'), the SC represented is 4–26 \[0358\] as \(<5803\>\), the alternative 'gapped fourth' chord to 4–22: note the presence of pc 0, the C formerly missing from the referential sonority.

Both bass tone, F, and the lowest inner voice, Ab, press on to G3 on beat 4, where the bass and accompanying voices recover set-class 4–19 \[0148\] \(<726A>\) as it occurred under the pickup to m.25. Appoggiatura-like gestures into referential sonority members, the alternative gapped-fourth set-class 4–26, the prominent rearranged presence of all pcs from the referential sonority, and of course the inversionally-derived \[014\] thematic idea itself: these features combine at m.25 to strike an impressive balance between contrast and associative return at this important formal juncture.

**The Second Idea**

**Example 4.12** provides an analytical reduction of mm.25–36, the 'second idea': a formal section which, in relation to the preceding main-theme section, combines the formal functions of 'subordinate theme' and 'consequent'. My reduction is based principally on—though it does not transcribe—the 'piano-sketch' core of Berg's Particell, folios 3 and 3v, a series of two-stave systems in ink which he subsequently expanded in pencil. (On fol.3v, Berg realized that the space requirements for the expansion of his core sketch for mm.32–37 would exceed the capacity of the page; he, therefore, undertook the expanded layout on the facing page, fol.4. Readers of the Particell are directed from fol.3v to fol.4 by the marking "Auszug —>.")
Example 4.12: Subordinate Theme, mm.25–36, analytical reduction
'Second idea' (Subordinate Theme or consequent): 'presentation' of basic idea [b.i.]. Though closely derived from the main theme, the 'second idea' shows greater redundancy in the repetition of the basic idea (b.i.), a quality often characteristic of subordinate theme structures. (In fact, the idea seems "stuck" in a fragmenting funk in the rotations of mm.26–27.)

However, in the complementary idea (c.i., beginning with the pickup to m.28), the similarity to the main theme c.i. (mm.17–19) becomes apparent. The contrast provided by the beginning of the second idea is, therefore, relatively short-lived, and in its push towards the climax, the passage beginning at m.28 (Wieder bewegter (T" II)) , which also recovers the 'dotted tag' figure in m.31, feels as much the renewed continuation of the main theme as it does the continuation of the second idea itself.

This, in turn, suggests that the form of the Präludium as a whole may mimic the design of so many other nineteenth-century "Preludes" (notably those by Chopin) which consist, in formal terms, of a single "period" with introduction and coda. In the case of Opus 6, this form would read:

Introduction (mm.1–15), Antecedent (m.16–24, with no cadence), expanded Consequent (beginning at m.25 but passing through the climax at m.36 and settling only after the the "A4" closing idea mm.40–42), and Coda (the various returns from m.42–56).

From the Example, it can be seen that the overall structural motion of the upper voice in this 'subordinate-thematic' section (mm.25–36) is an ascent from Ab5 through A5 and Bb5 to C6; namely, a motion through the potential ic4 (major third) between pcs Ab and C (the C originally missing) of the referential sonority. The main notes of this motion are marked with asterisks [*] in the Example. The smaller asterisks in m.35 show how the metrically accented pitches, E6 and D#6 (Eb6 in the score), reach above the climactic goal tone C6 in order to introduce it with a structural-framing statement of the
opening [014] cell as: \(<4^*3^*0^*\>). With similar structural-framing function, the flutes, in the extreme upper register of m.35 (see tiny notes), approach C7 at m.36 with the exact pitch-class succession that, following the initial [014] cell, really got things underway at m.28: the 'complementary idea' [c.i.], E−F−Ab−Gb−C, \(<45860\>, SC 5−13 [01248].

In the next paragraphs, we consider the harmonic, motivic, and formal features of the second idea section with reference to Example 4.12. The discussion is unavoidably somewhat dense, since this is one of the most complicated passages in all of Opus 6.

Beyond the motivic similarities to the main theme already discussed, the interest in the presentation of the second idea is largely harmonic. As Example 4.12 shows, a quality of ambivalence affects all the strong-beat sonorities in mm.25−27. The appoggiatura-like feeling at the beginning of each measure, coupled with the return of SC 4−19 [0148] <726A> (as bass note G and accompanying chord) suggests that the strong beats may serve as a kind of embellishment of this chord despite its weaker metrical placement.

The first beat of m.25 forms SC 6−44 [012569] as the union of downbeat 3−5 [016] <5B4> and off-beat 3−11 [037] in its major-triad form <803>. As stated earlier, the combination of bass note F and the off-beat accompaniment chord forms the alternative 'gapped-fourth' chord to 4−22, namely 4−26 [0358] <5803>. Beat 4 as a whole forms SC 6−21 [023468] as the union of 5−26 [02458] and 5−13 [01248], with 4−19 [0148] <726A> held invariant as the tune moves from E/Fb to Ab.

The first beat of m.26, in a similar fashion, forms SC 6−25 [013568] as the union of downbeat diminished trichord <2B5> and the minor-triad form of 3−11 [037] <904>. The D in the bass with the off-beat accompaniment chord produces the familiar 4−22 [0247] <2904>, and the entire sonority seems somewhat reminiscent of the first Klangfarbenakkord (chord D, m.9).15 Beat
4—since the tune’s rotation of the [014] motive trades F for E/Fb—forms SC
6–39 [023458] as the union of 5–37 [03458] and, again on the final eighth, 5–13
[01248].

Measure 27 effects a diminution of the 3-plus-1 rhythmic pattern of
mm.25 and 26. Beat 1 forms SC 6–6 [014568] as the union of two
inversionally-related 3–4 [015] set-classes, downbeat <0B4> and off-beat chord
<615>. (This [015] cell continues in the harp and tuba bass line over the next
two measures.) Over the returning bass note G3, the second half of beat 2
forms 5–26 [02458], again as the combination of 4–19 and E/Fb in the tune. On
beats 3 and 4 (second half), the accompaniment chords alone (hns.1–3 plus
vn.2) form a pair of ‘French-sixth’ sonorities in parallel chromatic descent,
i.e., 4–25 [0268] as <953B> and <482A>; both of these, with addition of the bass
tones, form SC 5–28 [02568], so that the final eighth of m.27 has rather strong
tonal drive into m.28 (quasi bVII—as V substitute—i in f#).

Complementary idea [c.i.], mm.28–30. In thematic-formal terms, the
similarity between the complementary idea (c.i.) of the main theme (mm.18–
19) and the c.i. for this second idea (mm.28–29) has been noted above; indeed,
the latter passage is the contour inversion of its predecessor. At m.29, b.3,
however, the sense of antecedent-phrase caesura ( * ) is quickly undermined
by a varied sequential repetition of its concluding portion, as <67 B37A 42>.
This sequence is built from two interlocking instances of SC 4–19 [0148], as
<67B3> and <B37A>, and, with the addition of the dyad at the beginning of
m.30, it also results in the (abstractly, not uncommon) embedding of SC 5–21
[01458] within its complement 7–21[0124589] (cf., more obviously, Reigen,
m.6).

Harmonically, the passage (mm.28–31) takes the following shape. The
downbeat of m.28 forms SC 5–30 [01468] as the union of two [026] trichords
(<608> violin 2 pizz., and <640> bassoons 1 and 2), with sustained bass note B2
The downbeat of m.29 follows with SC 5–28 [02368], similarly formed from the union of two [026] trichords (<739> and <971>) with sustained bass note E3. At the downbeat of m.30, this pattern can be understood to continue: with <84A>, <A82> and bass note F3, again forming SC 5–28 [02368] <5A284>. (These harmonic readings exclude the cello line [not shown] and the horn’s accented neighbour note F#3 at m.29.) Throughout these measures Berg keeps trichord [026], as well as the generative [014] and [016] cells, prominent in the accompanying wind voices (trumpet 2, bassoons 1 and 2, and clarinets). A Nebenstimme for first horn (m.28, b.4) actually begins with the full [014] incipit of the second idea (at T2, as <A767>), before counterpointing off.

Melodically, the Hauptstimme at m.28, following the segmentation of the violins’ bowing, forms SC 5–13 [01248] <45860>. Mechanically, its next four pitches would form SC 4–18 [0147] <734A>, and the final four pitches of the phrase 4–4 [0125] <2631>. Perhaps more revealing, however, is a segmentation which recognizes the appoggiatura character of the [014]-enclosed D#4 on beat 3 (<734>). SC 5–13 would then be followed by 5–26 [02458] <7(3)4A26>; and, overlapping this, the final five notes of the phrase, beginning with the tenuto triplet, would form 5–37 [03458] <A2631>: these SCs—5–13, 5–26, and 5–37—were the chordal sonorites formed from the combination of accompanying chord 4–19 <726A> with the three possible pitches of the [014] basic idea <8545>. (SC 5–13 is also present as the last five notes of m.28: <34A26>.)

In this segment of the overall structural motion from Ab5 to C5, a kind of ‘unfolding’ of the upper voice takes place. This unfolding is marked by the registral disposition of the appoggiatura-like dyads that begin each measure: the Ab5 (m.28) moves down to inner-register D#/Eb5 (in m.29); following the varied sequential repetition in the tune that shifts this D# to E (m.30), the E5 (in bassoon 3).
then moves back to the upper-register with the A5 in mm.30–31. During this passage, the longer-range ascent from Ab5 to C6 is charmingly anticipated in the pizzicato second violins—see the grace notes on the Example, which reach C6 just at the point the 'continuation' function takes over.

Continuation (mm.31–33). In the main theme, following the caesura at m.19, the violins yielded Hauptstimme status to oboes and flutes as a timbral signal of the thematic continuation; in the second idea, the trumpets (at the pickup to m.31) take over in a similar manner in order to signal the continuation towards the climax. The trumpet's melodic idea \( <56970.53144> \) begins and ends with SC 4–2 [0124]: \( <5697> \) (embedding \( <569> \) [014]), and \( <5314> \) (embedding \( <314> \) [013]). Also, the first five notes of the trumpet idea are slurred: this forms SC 5–36 [01247]; the same SC is picked up in a Nebenstimme entry for stopped horns in m.32 as \( <897528> \) (also embedding SC 4–2 [0124] \( <8975> \)).

Notwithstanding these details, the most important pc-set feature of the trumpet continuation is the underlined subset \( <9705> \): this is the referential tetrachord, 4–22 [0247]. Depended in m.31 from A5, the same tetrachord marks Bb5 at m.33 and C6 at the m.36 climax. In the process of getting us there, horns 1 and 2 (m.31, b.4) follow the trumpet with \( <670A3> \). The first two pitches appear as a chromatic variant of the trumpet pickup, \( <56> \) now \( <67> \), and the [014] \( <569> \) incipit of the former is traded in the latter for [016] \( <670> \) (with its registrally ambitious leap to C5).

A number of factors, then, combine to mark m.32 as a parenthetic (\textit{reculer pour mieux sauter}) insert into this process: the "poco rit." indication; the lower register of the pitches, C5–Bb4–Eb4 ([025]), doubled by violins ("\textit{mit dem Bogen geschlagen}"); their immediate, and meter-syncopating, T1 repetition, as C#–B–E (now pizzicato with trumpet and bassoons doubling); and, finally, the way Berg underscores the insert with two vertical instances.
of referential tetrachord 4–22 [0247]: on beats 2 (368A) and 3 (279B). The main structural ascent—Ab, mm.25 and 28; through A, m.31; Bb, m.33; and C, m.36—is broken by this parenthetic insert at m.32, a structural C–C# ‘neighbouring’ motion: the latter is then replicated in the bass at the downbeats of m.31 and m.33 and in the metric displacements of the treble at m.33–m.34 (see the various ‘c’ and ‘c#’ indications on the Example; the bass motion in m.33 will be discussed below).

The ‘continuation’ function of the m.31 trumpet figure is (after the parenthetic insert) allowed to continue: with the violins at the pickup to m.33, as <45A81654555>. The underlined subset, as noted earlier, is the structure-marking SC 4–22 [0247]. (Incidentally, the clarinet Nebenstimme, from m.32, b.3, also counterpoints with a figure that includes SC 4–22 <2431B6>.) The passage from mm.31–33—which moves the bass voice from C3 to C#3 and the treble voice from A5 to Bb5—is assisted by control of its downbeat sonorities. A mechanical interpretation of the score would find a nine-note verticality at the downbeat of m.31 (SC 9–10), but the harmonic idea (minus various neighbouring motivic details) comprises bass note, middle register diminished tetrachord (4–8; see the arpeggiated triple stops for violin and viola), and melodic tritone: this produces SC 7–31 [0134679] as <0,147A,39(moving to 17)>. Literal transposition at m.33 would produce <1,258B,4A(moving to 28)>, but intervening circumstances produce the slight modification to {1,268B,[no 4]A}, disposed as <18,26B,A>, forming SC 6–24 [013468]. SC 6–24 is also found on the downbeat of the intervening measure (m.32) <A62305>; and it is immediately preceded (on the final eighth of m.31) by a 5–31 [013691] {147AB} which preserves the same {147A} diminished tetrachordal subset as was found in its beat one 7–31 complement.
*Structural voice-leading motion in other voices.* As was the case with both introduction and main theme, in the subordinate theme section structural voice-leading interpretation of voices other than the main treble line is more problematic. The strongly emphasized E5–F5 at the beginning of the second idea suggests a kind of secondary line which moves through Gb5 at m.28 to G5 at m.31, perhaps again as a statement of the E–G third motive found in the basic idea and basslines of introduction and main theme.\(^{17}\)

Particularly challenging is the interpretation of this section's bass line. The F3 is forcefully attacked at the beginning of the second idea. However, the initially emphasized downbeats (mm.25–27), F3–D3–C3 (3–7 \([025]\)), all move strongly to G3 on their offbeats. The idea, perhaps, is to realize the third F2–Ab2 (mm.25 and 27) in the structural bass voice and the third G3–E3 (mm.25 and 27, also 29) in the 'tenor voice' simultaneously. The strong move to F# at m.28 would, in such a case, have to be interpreted as neighbouring in the bass and as passing in the tenor; the E3 in m.29—introduced by the bass 'cycle-of-fourths' \([ic5]\) remnant connecting F# through B to E—would conclude a motion through a third in the tenor voice.\(^{18}\) In this context the same E would serve in the bass voice as a lower neighbour to the F of m.25 which returns, via the varied sequential shift, at m. 30. In general, one should note that more structurally important bass notes are approached with statements of motive rather than by direct linear (or conventional tonal) voice leading.

The bass voice motion from F3 down to C3 (mm.30–31) is, comparatively, straightforward. And the chromatic descent from C3 to Ab/G#2 (mm.31–33) assists the push from C (m.31) to neighbouring C# (m.33).\(^{19}\) The same C–C# motion is embedded within this bass motion as the parenthetic insert in the upper voice, C5–C#5. In the bass voice, an expected return from C#3 back to C3 does not take place. Actually, Berg deleted exactly
such a return from m.33 of the Particell piano-sketch at the orchestration stage [see the square brackets on the reduction]; and two upward curved lines in pencil suggest that he somehow felt the deleted pitches were accounted for in the upper register. Such an accounting does not take place, however, until the oboes C#6 is returned to the violins C6 in mm.33–34.

In the score, instead of returning to C3 in m.33, the bassline embellishes the C#3 with an upper third, E3, (another reminder of the secondary C#–E motive from the introduction?) and goes on to answer the F3–C3 fourth from mm.30–31 with an Eb3–Bb2 fourth in m.34. This fourth then passes through A2 (forming [016] as <3A9> en passant) to Ab2 (which is also introduced from below with [016], as <238>). (The ‘ic2’ bass motion from m.35 to m.37 will be discussed in the context of the climax, below.)

Although the structural bass motion of the subordinate theme section as a whole seems relatively loose or undirected at the local level, the reduction shows (via the broken beams) that the main structural notes actually form a statement of the complete (i.e., including the missing C) hexachordal referential sonority—SC 6–32 [024579] as <57503A8>—which is expanded by the few ancillary motivic approaches and by the emphatic neighbouring motions mm.25–30 (from F to F#, as well as E back to F) and mm.31–33 (from C to C#). This kind of long-range projection of a partially ordered referential collection has been posited elsewhere in Berg’s music (see Forte 1991), though it perhaps represents a syntax too arcane for more than conceptual grasp.

Post-parenthetic continuation to climax. As the parenthetic C5–C#5 insert at m.32 was marked by syncopated groupings of three eighth notes, the C#6–C6 return in oboes and violins is also marked by three-beat cross-metric groupings, the accents falling on (m.33) beat 4 and (m.34) beat 3, respectively.
Harmonic clarity and sensitivity to pitch-class strings in the three measures leading up to the climax is overwhelmed by motivic density.

From the violin takeover at the pickup to m.33, the Hauptstimme entries go as follows: violin $\langle 45A816 \rangle$ (SC 6–46 [012469], embedding 4–22); oboe $\langle 561B59 \rangle$ (6–22 [012468], beginning with 4–16 [0157] and ending with 4–24 [0248]); violin $\langle 9A0A39 \rangle$ (4–13 [0136]); overlapped by oboe and clarinet $\langle 564271 \rangle$ (SC 6–3 [012356], beginning with 4–2 [0124] and ending with 4–13 [0136]); again overlapped by violin $\langle 89319 \rangle$ (4–16 [0157]), and finally (as "allesübertönende Hauptstimme"), trumpets 1 and 2 $\langle 120A38 \rangle$ (SC 6–9 [012357], but serving to combine the C–C#–C neighbouring motive and the culminating statement of 4–22 from climax tone C6).

Complex as this picture appears, neither this description, nor Example 4.12, begins to account for the textural density at the penultimate point (nearly twenty real or collateral parts!). Though the Example includes the onslaught of horns that transforms the ‘tag figure’ into a premonition of the martellato dotted rhythm that takes over the Marsch (m.107ff), the Example omits numerous Nebenstimme entries. But it is in part the sheer complexity of the passage from mm.33–35 that allows the climax—itself a rather complex referential, mensural-canonic, and structural voice-leading event—to appear as a moment of comparative breakthrough and clarity.

**Climax, Liquidation, and Return**

The remainder of Berg’s Particell (folios 4v and 5, from mm.38–45 and mm.46–56, respectively) is in short score without any initial piano-sketch systems. Though the score is largely written in pencil, Berg traced over several of the main motives or individual notes in ink—apparently as a kind of highlighting and clarification technique. The remainder of our discussion of the piece is laid out in Examples 4.13 and 4.14.
Example 4.13: Climax and liquidation, mm.36-42

mensural canon X:
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Example 4.13 (preceding page in oblong format) shows the fff climactic chord of the Präludium (m.36; at "Climax"). The original referential sonority is given in the immediately preceding square brackets for purposes of comparison. While the central portion of the chord is preserved, the Ab and G trade registers, and the C, originally absent, is now ubiquitous. What of the two 'new' pitches, D1 and B1, in the bass? Both of these are on their way to C, completing a registrally displaced whole-tone descent (ic2) from Ab2 (m.35) to C1 (doubled at C2, m.37) <86B420>: as if the bass, too, at the end of the subordinate section finds a way to realize the space Ab–C [ic 4(/8)] of the referential sonority within which the upper voice has been composed over the course of the subordinate theme section.

The top voice, as was stated earlier, introduces its climactic C6 (doubled at C7) from above via a motivic reaching over, a statement of the [014] motive <42, 31, 0A> as E6 in oboes, D#6/Eb6 in violins, and C6 (or C7) in most melodic voices at m.36. Almost incidentally, the sixteenth-note Nebenstimme figure for violins [not shown in the Example] produces referential SC 5–23 [02357] as <0A381>. And the horns hammer out the RH- in a trilling six-note chord, the main notes effecting set-class 6–11 [012457] <B8075A>—though the chord is formed by the addition, above pitch B1, of referential sonority 5–23 [02357] as <8075A>, a revoicing of the 5–23 from m.6 with an exchange of the now ubiquitous pc 0 (C) for the original pc 3 (Eb).

The asterisks [*] above the top staff show how the upper portion of the climactic sonority is recalled when the register is briefly regained at the top of motive beta in m.38, and when the Hauptrhythmus (RH-) returns with its accompanying chords at m.42. This suggests that C (as C5) acts as structural upper voice at m.36 (heavily reinforced by C7, C6, C4, C3 and by delayed C2 and C1 in m.37) and that it is recovered at m.42 (again reinforced by the subsequent pedal point, mm.44–47).
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G4. As with motive alpha, the underlying progression of motive gamma unfolds an augmented sonority, a similarity confirmed by another statement of alpha which immediately follows (m.39, b.2). The abstract basis underlying motive gamma—a motion in parallel major thirds which connects \(<Eb-G> (<37>)\) down to \(<G-B> (<7B>)\)—is shown on the staff above. The break from this abstract design in the upper voice is made for motivic reasons, to accomplish a statement of the C#-E motive (m.39, b.1), which recurs shortly thereafter as the 'braking ostinato' motive in the bass (mm.40–41).

My voice-leading sketch construes the alpha-beta-gamma outburst (mm.37–39) as parenthetic. The normal 'liquidation' of motives which might take place at this formal juncture in a classical composition—namely the replacement of the characteristic motives of the piece with conventional cadential figures—is here eschewed in favour of their transformation into cyclic motives alpha-beta-gamma. The Ab4 (m.36) is retained while the 'alto' voice moves below it with Ab-Gb-F; the upper A-flat is then squeezed to A-natural at the beginning of the alpha motive. The same Ab-Gb-F motion, doubled at the major third below, also links motive alpha to motive beta.

The bass motion at this point is quite strong in triadic-tonal drive: from the mixed six-four over doubled C (m.37, b.3; 4–17 [0347] <00859>), the bass unfolds to G3 against the treble's alpha-motive elaboration of an F augmented sonority; the bass then drops strongly from C#3 to F#2, which implies that an 'F# major seventh chord' marks the return of the "A2" figure at the downbeat of m.38.

Within the parentheses, the two statements of motive alpha (m.37, b.3; m.39, b.2) imply a potentially literal sequence which would answer \(<9a865>\) with \(<B^6A87>\). Instead, the latter statement is adjusted so that its final two notes (Ab–G) bridge across the closing parenthesis to begin the upper voice of the 'braking ostinato' (m.39, b.4). (The reader will recall that this is the "A4"
passage from Berg’s sketch [Example 4.4, above.]) Before the parentheses, the upper voice at the climax progresses C6–Bb5–(Eb5)–Ab4; following the parentheses, the initial Ab4 picks up where the previous progression left off and satisfactorily ‘corrects’ the twice-stated Ab–Gb–(F), which introduced motives alpha and beta (m.37, b.4–m.38 and m.38, b.4–m.39), to Ab–G.

The returning ‘chaconne’ chords, ‘D–E–F’, beginning with ‘D’ at the end of Example 4.13, are reorchestrated for sustained strings, punctuated (particularly so in the first sfz) by the six horns. The Eb RH° also returns, but an octave lower, in flutes and bassoons instead of high alto trombone. Why? The Eb must appear in this register: over the ‘braking ostinato’ E2–C#2, the Eb4 completes the structural voice-leading motion which began from the Ab4 at the upbeat to m.40. (As the example shows, this motion is also imitated in the ‘tenor’ against an additional reworking of the “A2” thematic idea.) Particularly beautiful is the delaying repetition of the dotted-rhythm upbeat figure in m.40, b. 2–3; the rhythm of course recalls the dotted tag, but the pitch-classes constitute a compressed recollection of the appoggiatura-like gestures which terminate the [014] motives at the beginning of both main and subordinate themes: <4787> and <8545>; the underscored dyads, Ab–G and E–F shown on Ex.4.13, represent the main [MT] and subordinate [ST] themes, respectively.

We of course now recognize the Ab4–Eb4 progression as the principal structural motion of the upper voice in mm.6–16. As Ex.4.13 shows, this fourth motion also seems to be worked into the bass voice which emerges from the climax at m.36: this would explain why the Ab2 of the referential sonority is placed in the lower register there. By the time the F#2 is reached in m.38, there can be little doubt of the structural correspondence, because the associated “A2” thematic idea (cf. mm.11–13, bass) is recalled as well.

Example 4.14: Return, mm.42–56

Reigen interpolation

Märchenhand

m.51

m.55–56

BerG ? T.T.
Following the return of the RH\textsuperscript{\textminus} and its chords D–E–F, there occurs a second, and beautifully atmospheric, parenthetic interpolation (m.44ff)—a “fore-echo,” so to speak, of Reigen. This is cyclic idea delta. Links in and out of the passage are shown in the Example: note the 4–19 —> 4–27 SCs at beginning and end of the parentheses. One of the charming features of the ‘D–E–F’ chordal progression is the wistfully cloying qualities of its final chord (SC 4–20 [0158]), the mixture of ‘major seventh chord’ plus the RH\textsuperscript{\textminus} ‘minor third’ Eb over bass C3 (here reinforced by pedal C2). At the beginning of the interpolation the enclitic Eb–E conflict is ‘resolved’ in favour of the E; the SC of course remains 5–21 [01458]). Motivically, an E–C\# motive (beginning the delta idea, mm.44–45) is once again answering C–Eb (the implied arpeggiation from C5 down to Eb4, with its enclitic E, mm.42–44).

Within the parentheses, the delta-idea E–C\# introduces Bb\#, which pitch is really retained through the subsequent motion: Bb–Ab–G–(Bb)–Gb–F–D.\textsuperscript{34} It is quickly apparent that this Reigen-delta interpolation shares further characteristics with the Präludium for it concludes with the 5–37 [03458] tag from “A2”, <7A652>. At T\textsubscript{1} in comparison with its previous occurrences, the tag makes a sort of reversed Doppler effect. The oboe Hauptstimme highlights the final four notes as SC 4–19 [0148] <A652>, and the final three pitches form the familiar [014] motive as <652> (immediately echoed by cellos and celesta in mm.47–48).

The melody of this Reigen gesture, with the help of its accompanying chords (which feature alternating whole tone collections), converges on D4. (Note that Bb is still retained in the chord which supports the arriving D: again SC 4–19, as <36A2>.) The B-flat then moves to a neighbouring B-natural (B4) in mm.47–48, supported firstly by the framing 4–19 [0148] sonority <3703B>, and then by SC 4–27 [0258] expressed as tonal sonority of exquisite enticement.
The tonal transparency of this “D-minor plus major sixth” chord of m.48 has occasioned comment—sometimes referred to as the “Märchenhand” chord since, similarly associated with a B–C–B neighbouring motion, it is thus texted in Berg’s op. 2, no. 3 Song.²⁵ Notwithstanding additional D minor allusions in both Reigen and the Marsch, its qualities of tonal resolution must be deemed illusory within the established contexts of the Präludium.

Stravinsky (1959, 73) cited m.49 as one of the many “striking sonorous inventions” in Opus 6. One notes the skittering dolce as the second desk, first violins highlight the arrival of Bb, while the 3rd Horn provides a trilling reminder—B-natural–C. The cellos oscillate between the outer notes of chord ‘C’, celebrating its arrival. For the bass, having stepped from D1 to C1 in m.36 (beginning of Ex.4.13), and again from D2 to C3 (and pedal C2) in m.42, finally leaves behind the tonal allusion/illusion of m.48 and proceeds upward to E2, thereby returning the pedal C of m.44 (via a retrogression of chords ‘A–B–C’) to the bass G of the referential sonority in m.51.

The link into m.49 is shown on the staff below: if the interlocking [014] motives on trombone followed exactly those of the bassoon, an Eb3 would be due. This Eb is supplied (as Eb4) by the [014] Hauptmotive <632> of the solo double bass in m.49. An Eb2 was also due to complete the Ab–Eb motion in the bassline at the end of the ‘braking ostinato’—now, remarkably, C2–Eb2 answers E2–C#2.²⁶ Within the parenthetic passage, the B4 (mm.47–48) must be understood as a neighbour (Nn) to Bb4 (m.45). The parenthetic Bb4 is itself a kind of anticipation of the ‘real’ Bb4 which arrives at m.49 at the top of chord ‘C’. And a central purpose of the inserted passage has been to effect a smooth link between the reordering of the ‘D–E–F’ chordal progression with its structural C5 (at m.42) and the retrograded ‘C–B–A’ progression with its structural Bb4–Ab4 (beginning at m.49).²⁷
At m.49, the solo double bass Hauptstimme (doubled by celesta) is a retrogression of the muted trumpet Nebenstimme from m.8; and the bassoon Hauptmotive from m.8 also returns in retrograde on muted trumpet (doubled by harp harmonics) at m.49. Such retrogression means that the original pointing value of the semitone motion G–Ab is lost, and so, with the arrival of chord B (m.50, b.2), Berg staggers a neighbouring motion in parallel fourths, Ab–G–Ab over Eb–D–Eb.

The members of referential sonority ‘A’ sneak into their return: the Ab4 is coincident with the conclusion of its neighbouring motion (m.50, b.4) and timbrally marked by fluttetonguing trumpet; the bass G3 (cello and felt-sticked timpani roll), and inner voices F3 (English horn) and Bb3 (clarinet) arrive with varied rhythmic values at the beginning of m.51, and are joined by the Eb4 as it concludes its neighbouring motion on beat 2. At that point, after a last ‘Wogend-Echo’ oscillation of opening chords A–B–A, the percussion resurfaces and the pitches of the referential sonority are returned to the depths. The xylophone (in m.52) provides a final animation of the Ab–Eb fourth (see the bracket ‘J’ on the Example) and the duration of silence between sounds, as well as the number of percussion timbres in each chord, increases to the end of the piece, in an additive procedure which is the reverse of the ‘counting-in’ which we noted in the introduction.

The bassoon Ab4 departs at the beginning of m.53 and the timpani (with leather sticks) returns the referential tetrachord 4–22 (‘P’) to the register of m.3. Even here, literal-minded repetition is evaded, for the sonority is partitioned differently than it was at the opening: <7A35> as <75>+<A3> now becomes <35>+<A7>. The final Bb–G perhaps represents Berg’s parting gesture of signature (in the available German note names of the referential sonority, Berg), before a single framing stroke on the tam-tam separates this particular composing between the tones from silence.
Notes to Chapter 4, Präludium:

1I owe the apt descriptor ‘braking ostinato’ to Robert Falck. Jarman calls this ff interjection (first at mm.11–13) ‘Theme I’ (1979, 39). The ‘alpha, beta, gamma, and delta’ labels for the cyclic motives are the work of Mark DeVoto 1980, also 1984.

2The idea of “composing between the tones of a referential sonority,” as a localized and more extended phenomenon found in tonal as well as post-tonal and pre-tonal music, has been part of my analytical outlook for many years. The term “referential sonority” probably originated with Milton Babbitt. The phrase “composing between the notes [or tones]” is the coinage of Edward Laufer. Laufer presented some of his analyses at the McGill Theory Symposium and at the Eastman School of Music in 1986 in an unpublished paper entitled “A Linear Approach to Some Twentieth-Century Compositions.” That paper included the analysis of Schoenberg’s Op.16, No.3 to which this chapter later refers. Laufer 1993 extends the analytical approach to selections from Webern’s Opp. 6 and 10 and to Schoenberg’s Op.16, No.2.

3The “A2” theme is also found on sketchbook page 27, though two octaves higher (A5 to C#5). Given the vaguely march-like quality of the ideas which precede “A2” on that same page, the sketch may refer to the recapitulation of the idea in the Marsch (A4 to C#4 range, mm.160–161) or to the more generalized “chromatic creeping” (DeVoto 1991) that begins to infect the later Marsch ideas. The “A2” idea also forms the quasi-cadential tag of cyclic idea delta (the Reigen interpolation, mm.45–46).

4A rhythmic sketch with the annotation “Mitte Anfang” is found on page 22 of the sketchbook. The rhythmic figure over “Mitte” became the opening of the second idea, mm.24–25; that over “Anfang” became the complementary idea of the Main Theme, mm.17–19.

5Page 25 of the sketchbook contains the annotations “A1” and “im[m]er leise”. The “A1” cannot be reconciled with the “A1” of page 23; it is, rather, a rough stick-rhythm sketch for the opening delta chordal progression of Reigen (discussed in Chapter 5). However, page 26 is actually the recto side of the leaf; that is, the “A4” on page 26 is the successor to—though, as is shown above, not the direct continuation of—the “A3” on page 24.

6The only sketch for the Präludium in A-Wst other than those already described is a brief citation of the opening 4–22 chord (page 45) in its spacing of mm.4–6. The “A4” designation of the probable Marsch sketch on page 40 cannot be reconciled with the Präludium “A4” of page 26. The 4/4 rhythmic sketches on page 21 are rather too indefinite to be assigned to any particular place in the Opus 6 pieces.
The technical term for this procedure in visual arts is 'scumbling'. The author hopes, at a later date, to produce an 'anatomy' of musical scumbling techniques, since the effect may be traced from the rhythmic-metric scumblings of harmony in Beethoven's late style to the scumblings of otherwise emphatic tonal arrival found in Opus 6 (see, in particular, m.155 of the Marsch) and so many other twentieth-century compositions.


Schoenberg, ibid., 482: "So kommt es, daß sie [die Quarten] hier nicht bloß als Melodie oder als rein impressionistische Akkordwirkung auftreten, sondern ihre Eigentümlichkeit durchdringt die gesamte harmonische Konstruktion, sie sind Akkorde wie alle anderen." Translation from Schoenberg 1978, 404.

Much early time was lost by this analyst in attempting to rationalize some such ascent above Ab4. (The line which results is identical to that found in Talyor 1989, Ex.9, p.131.) It is only when this upper line is recognized as the product of motions from inner voices that the structural voice-leading continuity across the ff interjection and the introduction's overall Ab–Eb fourth motion as a composing between the tones of the referential sonority become clear.

This editorial change was introduced by one of Berg's students/editorial assistants (Otto Jokl or Hans Erich Apostel). Though perfectly reasonable from the perspective of notational consistency in the printed score, the change seems to misrepresent slightly Berg's intentions for a blaring abandonment on the E3. The shorter flare on the crescendo mark was maintained through the time of Berg's Fassung letzter Hand [A-Wn F 21 Berg 141].

The voice-leading analysis of my Ex.4.9(b) is derived from the unpublished Laufer 1986 paper cited in note 2, above. It should be apparent that my Example does not represent a detailed analysis of Schoenberg's piece. Laufer also accounts for the 'stacked fifths/croaking frogs' motive in terms of a composing-betwen-the-tones of Schoenberg's referential sonority. Detailed discussion of the various strata of the piece is undertaken in many well-known analyses, including Burkhart 1973, Forte 1973, and Rahn 1980. The alternative—and more conventional—slant on interpreting the voice-
leading of the passage is expressed in Rahn 1980, 65: "The ubiquity of G# in mm. 1-13 makes its demise in m. 15 quite shocking. The sense of abruption is artfully compounded by a superficial voice-leading at m. 15 of Ab (G#) and Eb to Gb and Db respectively (the ‘syntactic’ voice-leading carries the Ab up to Bb one beat later, in voice 5 of the Chord); for the Bb and Db so conspicuously arrived at in m. 15 are the only two pc missing from the 10-pc chord at mm. 9 1/2-10, and ever since. The Bb that enters in m. 15 was not present in every simultaneity since m. 1 (as was G#), but is the only pc in common to Tp0, Tp-1, and Tp2 and thus to the largescale structure of mm. 1-20. This Bb is proud of its role as sole survivor, as evidenced by the smug piccolo/celeste high E's in mm. 16-17. The entrance of the bass D of Tp2 in m. 14, one measure early, prepares us for similar shenanigans in the two incomplete chords of m. 23." Note that Rahn’s "‘syntactic’ voice-leading" is, in my interpretation, the transpositional-relational 'scaffolding' on which a more fundamental structural voice-leading syntax is excercised: the composing between the tones of the referential sonority. And I would maintain that, though it is undeniably a surface action, the “superficial voice-leading” at m.15 has a profound role to play as the initiator of the structural motion to the inner voice.

13Smith 1986, 145-146: Max Deutsch (1892-1982) relates a fascinating anecdote about a session in Mödling where Schoenberg challenged his students’ knowledge of his music with the statement: “This third orchestra piece is a fuga.” Berg’s analytical notes do not explicitly acknowledge the canonic basis of Schoenberg’s piece: he may have been unaware of it.

14Chords E and F occur as follows: E=5-20 [01568], T0E <A3827> (m.10), T3E <16B5A> (m.21, b.1), T4E <2706B> (m.23, b.1); T3F=5-13 [01248] <3A264>, embedding 4-19 [0148] <3A26> (m.21, b.2), T4F' <4B375>, embedding 4-19 <4B37>. Concerning the change from F to F': T0F (m.10, b.4) was 5-21 [01458] <05B43> and embedded 4-20 [0158] <05B4>. However, it is easily seen that 4-19 [0148] <05B3> was also embedded in 5-21 at m.10, and this change of emphasis from one embedded tetrachord to another—from 4-20 to 4-19—results in the mutation of F into F’. Sonority 4-19 is then maintained through the chromatic ascent of mm.23-24: <4B37>, <5048>, <6159>, and <726A>. Given this harmonic basis, the stopped horn note, Gb (concert Cb), m.23, b.4 in the score, should almost certainly read G-natural (concert C) as it is clearly found in the Particell and in Berg’s original autograph score (NY-pm Lehman collection). The (erroneous) Gb first appears in the faircopy (NY-pm Cary collection) upon which the 1923 and subsequent revisions were based.

15There is some rationale for this resemblance to chord ‘D’ (m.9). Chord ‘D’ <294170> represents SC 6-47 [012479]; 6-25 [013568] (m.26) is its Z-related pair [icv 233241], and the two instances share four of six pcs in common.
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4–26, the complement of 8–26, at m.25 as the "alternative" 'gapped-fourth-chord' SC to 4–22, such a line of reasoning would merely compound abstractions here.) SC 8–22, however, covers the referential pentachord 5–23 a remarkable five times, and it covers 4–22 seven times. Berg would have been entirely capable of making the most of this richness were such relations the central factor in his compositional decisions. One suspects, however, that such inclusional niceties were seldom Berg's central motivating factor.

Rather, as in the present situation, the 'motivating' element is the 'motive' itself: the canonic handling of 4–22 as its specific pitch-class string <0A38>, in conjunction with the recollection of the referential sonority. The choice of D1 (rather than Db1) in the bass at m.36 as the setup for motion to C1 (m.37, b.3)—in addition to the role of D in the registrally-manipulated whole-tone descent from Ab3 to C1—may have more to do with its tonal allusion to 'climactic six-four-ness' and the subsequent tonal allusiveness of the motion D2 to C2 at mm.42–45. The downward D-to-C motions, though tonally more typical, are contextually 'corrected' by the upward D2 to E2 motion of m.49, with the return of chord 'C'; i.e., a motion less tonally typical, but more convincing in the context of the chordal and motivic successions that characterize the piece.

Motives alpha, beta, gamma, and delta are so designated because they recur in the other two pieces of Opus 6. See DeVoto 1980 and 1984. My supernova image was triggered by the coincidence of 'Shelton 1987a', which is not a bibliographical reference but the real supernova explosion detected in 1987 by a University of Toronto astronomical observer, at the same time I was first attempting an adequate description of m.36ff. The image stuck because the ensuing alpha, beta, gamma motives immediately reminded me of the classic early paper on Big Bang Theory by Ralph Alpher, Hans Bethe (in absentia), and George Gamow that appeared in the Physical Review (April 1, 1948), commonly known to particle physicists and cosmologists as the "alpha, beta, gamma" paper. Bethe actually had nothing to do with the paper, but was persuaded by Gamow to lend his name for the pun of it.

Another version of this cyclic-motivic interjection is given in Example 5.1 as the lead-off to Reigen.

Admittedly, the 'Bb4–D4' motion within the delta statement is not easily reconciled with other 'composings between the tones' which have been interpreted in the piece. On the other hand, a Bb–F motion with subtended D (which is exactly analogous to the C# subtended from E in the original statement of "A2") provides a more relevant reading. It is intriguing to note that the Hauptrhythmus chords at the m.36 climax contain, in the piano sketch of Berg's Particell, a D4 against their upper voice Bb4. The D4, which matches the bass note, is not present in the orchestral realization: it was replaced by further registral reinforcement of C.
Several commentators have argued for triadic tonal syntax in Opus 6, and there are undeniable moments of tonal allusion and triadic (or extended triadic) centricity. Micznik 1986 comments on the 'semiotic value' of several such tonalisms in the Präludium; Archibald 1965 and 1968 (also Archibald 1989) outlines the various means of tonal focus in Reigen and in Berg's other early works (as does Lewis 1981 for op.5, no.3); DeVoto 1984 discusses tonal allusions in the Marsch. In the Präludium, apart from this D minor "Märchenhand" chord, the most obvious tonal allusions are found in: the pitch content of the opening collection and its orientation about Eb; the progression of chords 'D–E–F' to C major-minor at m.10 (where the sonority is quasi-deceptive in Eb major), and also m.44 (where it moves more explicitly to C); the suggestion of F minor at the beginning of the second idea (m.25); the multiregister emphasis on C at the climax (m.36) though quickly driving into F# at m.38; and—with considerably greater subtlety—the gravitation towards F# major which does not materialize in the retrogression of chords A–B–C near the end. Fourth-chord constructions in triadic-tonal situations were valuable to Schoenberg, Berg, and others precisely because of their multivalent potential. For example, chord A could be moved to C minor with a mere inflection of Bb to B; positing a C# 'root' below the bass G, on the other hand, would move the chord to F# major; and one must not forget Schoenberg's own inflection of the chord into F major (eventually as bIII of E) in the Chamber Symphony. Such tonalisms help to focus referential collections and to enhance secondary, and occasionally primary, points of formal articulation, or to provide temporary—and (as is the case in m.48) often deceiving—respite within larger motions. The latter are more fundamental and are determined by the projection of motives and the 'composings between the tones' outlined in this analysis.

25 This pairing of E–C# and Eb–C should be recalled from its many earlier instances; see detail sketch Example 4.10 and Figure 4.3 for a tabulation.

26 The final progression of chords 'C–B–A' suggests an extended dominant motion towards F# major: chord 'C' would be built on the natural VII step with the third degree Bb/A# on top; chord 'B' would introduce the V step with suspended fourth (F#), seventh (B), ninth (Eb/D#), and with the second degree Ab/G# on top; chord 'A' is also understandable as a dominant function in F# (entirely so to any Jazz bass player via "tritone substitution" rules) since a C# posited beneath the chord, enharmonic spellings notwithstanding, would result in a dominant seventh chord with major thirteenth, major ninth, and both flat and normal fifth. The reader is invited to supply such a C# and to send the progression 'home' to F# major. The progression—blessedly—is abjured by Berg.
Taylor 1989 discusses the timbral subtleties of the final six measures in detail; see his Figure 2, page 138, for a neat tabulation of the orchestration which also indicates the additive silence procedure.

The Particell orchestration calls for small tam-tam, though the orchestral score and all subsequent documents call for the large tam-tam which also began the work.
5  

*Reigen*: blocks, chains, and cycles; sonority, theme, and form.

Berg’s *Reigen*, the middle (though last-composed) of the Opus 6 pieces, is ostensibly the most transparent. Yet the piece soon deflects a frontal assault under any one methodological banner. In as much as the *Präludium* is about “harmony”—about an underlying chordal progression and a structural voice-leading procedure that ‘composes between the tones’ of a referential sonority—*Reigen* is about “form”: it concerns the broad coordination of sonority and theme in an extension of traditional formal design. In *Reigen*, one must “dance around” the documentary and analytical issues.

We will therefore find it useful to take a multivalent approach organized under the rubrics of our title. We tack across *Reigen* on three courses and find: successions of sonority blocks, chains of motivic details, and cycles of interlocking thematic ‘characters’. These observations (at times assisted by documentary evidence in the form of Berg’s unpublished sketches, Particell, and autograph scores) lead us to recognize that Arthur Schnitzler’s play *Reigen* (supplemented by the numerology of Wilhelm Fliess’s theory of biocycles) served Berg as the inspiration for the formal and programmatic subtext of his work.

Although the correspondence of titles has been noted on various occasions, the credit for developing the case (both pro and con) for a more
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Documentary Introduction, part 1: Schnitzler and Berg

Figure 5.1: Cyclical Formal Designs of Schnitzler's Reigen and Berg's Reigen

[Written 1896/97; privately published 1900; published 1903 (Berg's copy extant at the Alban Berg Stiftung, Vienna), 1914, 1921 and 1922 (with etchings); 1921 Vienna performance closed by police; 1921 Berlin performance results in famous obscenity trial.]
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5 6
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4 7
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3
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Alban Berg, 1885–1935. Reigen, op. 6, "no. 2"; 'Charakterstück'/ 'Walzer'
[Sketched 1913, drafted Particell 1914, fair copy 1915, first published edition 1923. First reads Schnitzler’s play—according to Frida Semler, 'not aloud'—summer of 1904; again circa 1914?; measure numbers are provided below the tempo markings; the numbers in boldface posit the pattern of correspondence with Schnitzler’s scenes.]
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Figure 5.1 (on the preceding page) juxtaposes the cyclical formal designs of Viennese physician and dramatist Arthur Schnitzler’s notorious play *Reigen* and Berg’s orchestral *Charakterstück* of the same name. In this introduction, we will concentrate on the description of Schnitzler’s play and will consider only the broad formal design of Berg’s piece. At the end of the chapter we will again consider the two works together, this time with Berg in the lead.

Schnitzler’s *Reigen* was notorious due to sex. The play consists of a series of ten dialogues between pairs of male and female characters, wherein one of the characters in each scene is carried forward to a new partner in the next scene—eleven moments of sexual encounter are indicated with a full line of dashes in the play’s text. *Reigen* means round dance, where the dancers stand and move in a circle. In Schnitzler’s play the circle is never present in its entirety—there is no ensemble. But the circular form promised by the title closes with the recurrence of the Prostitute in the last scene. In fact, there is a suggestion of a spiral, since the Count pauses to greet a Chamber Maid in the play’s final moment.

The spectators’ viewpoint approximates the detachment of an overhead perspective on the square-dancers’ ‘grand chain’: it is as if we are following segments of intersecting circles, now left, now right, now male, now female, following the progress of one character into the next scene and partner, only to follow the progress of that partner into the scene thereafter. This ‘grand-chain’ scheme of Schnitzler’s play is shown in Figure 5.2:

**Figure 5.2: Chain of interlocking characters in Schnitzler’s *Reigen*.**

| Prostitute /Ch.Maid /Woman /SWT /Actress /[Prostitute] |
| Soldier /Man /Husband /Poet /Count |
| Scene 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 |
Schnitzler's characters represent the hierarchy of fin-de-siècle Viennese social structure, and this is shown in the block format of Figure 5.3:

**Figure 5.3: Block of fin-de-siècle Viennese society in Schnitzler's *Reigen***.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Male Characters</strong></th>
<th><strong>Female Characters</strong></th>
<th><strong>Social Class Represented</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Actress</td>
<td>aristocratic, military</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>successful artistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husband</td>
<td>Young Married Woman</td>
<td>upper-middle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young Man</td>
<td></td>
<td>upper-middle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Poet)</td>
<td>(Sweet Young Thing)</td>
<td>(bohemian artistic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(lower-middle)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soldier</td>
<td>Chamber Maid</td>
<td>servant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prostitute</td>
<td>lower, military</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>lowest</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Prostitute opens and closes the *Lustspiel*, linking the social extremes of the old military-aristocratic regime, Soldier and Count. The Chamber Maid effects the bridge between the lower-class Soldier to whom she might aspire and the upper-middle class Young Man whom she must (not so unwillingly) serve. The Young Man sows his wild oats in the servant class, but cuckolds, in his next scene, the character who holds the very social position to which he must eventually aspire. The central delusion is found in bourgeois upper-middle-class marriage. The Young Married Woman is separated from her husband in age and in aesthetic outlook: he deludes himself with a vague moral-philosophical view of marriage as an icon of purity; she has strayed from this path in the previous scene and must now face marriage as a cover for a liberal aesthetic of pragmatic hedonism.
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Young Man reaches up the social hierarchy to the Young Married Woman just as the Poet reaches up the artistic (and social) hierarchy to the Actress. The Sweet Young Thing is the freelance parallel to the institutionally-contained Chamber Maid; the institutionally-constrained Young Married Woman emulates the free-spirited fashion and action of the powerful Actress. "Husband and whore are at opposite poles," as Falck has put it, and the false moral pillar of upper-middle-class marriage rests on quicksand, the foundation of prostitution which unites both ends of the social hierarchy (Count and Soldier).\(^5\)

How does Berg's piece live up to its name? *Reigen*, as we have stated, is a choreographic image. The dance-like character is easily found in the waltz tempo sections, but what of the formal design? Barring the sectional design of an actual waltz, one might expect the musical-formal realization to be some form of rondo, and—with due modifications—we will later realize this is largely the case. But it is by no means obvious: Bruce Archibald, alternatively, has described *Reigen* as a "kind of sonata form with an introduction and a coda in contrasting duple meter" (1968, 73; and he provides a chart to that effect in 1989, 117); Mark DeVoto has suggested a large interior Bogenform framed by the complementary archform of Introduction and Coda (1980, 102). Both views have their merits: Archibald's recognition of main and subordinate thematic groups will be seconded in my rondo assessment, and DeVoto's arch shape may be read directly off Figure 5.1, above.

Neither formal description, however, yields a structure which is necessarily rounded. But when Berg's formal design is laid out as in Figure 5.1, the cross-circle relations are revealed. The introduction (mm.1-13) and its continuing transition (mm.14-20) are balanced by the penultimate retransition (mm.105-110) and coda (mm.111-121). The Walzertempo
(mm.20–32) is given its counterbalancing recapitulation (mm.94–105). Two "decelerating" sections follow the Waltz (namely, mm.33–41 and mm.42–49) and two "accelerating" sections reintroduce the Waltz after the General Pause [G.P., m.82] (namely, mm.83–88 and mm.89–94). The central climax within the Etwas gehalten section (m.66 of mm.56–68) is offset by the two most energetic sections of the work, Schwungvoll (mm.49–55) and Derb bewegt (mm.69–82). Berg's design also has its spiral aspects: the returning Waltz shifts a semitone higher than its original pitch (cf. mm.24 and 98), and the coda both spirals past its expected goal tone (past bass C#/Db to G) and dangles a final motive over the edge of the form. Discussion of the qualifying details of this general design must be deferred for the moment, but the balanced circularity, the "round" in "round dance," is at least accountable.

What about the "dance"? In a letter to Schoenberg (26–03–14) Berg mentions that his projected Suite of "Charakterstücke" will contain a "Marsch" and a "Walzer". Fifteen days later (10–04–14) Berg reports that he will himself serve as the basis for the march 'character'—Marsch eines Asthmaticikers. He spends most of the Summer completing the Marsch and then reworks the Präludium from abandoned Symphony materials. Was the character of the "Walzer" also to be autobiographical?

Much of Reigen may well be waltz-like, but Berg's rhythm is, in general, far too subtle and flexible to allow the waltzing to continue much beyond the startings-up and windings-down of mm.20–34, 39–40, 73–76, and 94–100. Berg nowhere mentions the title Reigen for the second piece prior to mid-July of 1914, in a letter to his wife (13–07–14). Indeed, it would appear that the title was literally pencilled in at the last minute—the title page for the piece in Berg's Particell (A–Wn F 21 Berg 12, folio 6) is entirely in red ink except for the word "(Reigen)" which is added in pencil.
By July of 1914, I do not think Berg was trying to decide between the titles “Walzer” and “Reigen,” he was trying to decide if he could call the piece “Reigen” and get away with it. Would anyone else notice the Schnitzler allusion? More importantly, if they did recognize it, would that open the way to the disclosure of more personal programmatic contents which Berg would prefer to keep hidden?

Consciousness of such a program might distract attention from the merits of the music itself. This was how Berg later felt about his use of strict musical forms in Wozzeck, his artificial combination of movements in the Chamber Concerto, his serial manipulations and quotations in the Lyric Suite, Lulu, and the Violin Concerto. In all of these cases, however, there are also more personal, autobiographical layers of program which lie beneath the surface allusions.

The title “round dance” seems straightforward enough, but it is not as common as one might think. Indeed, the Viennese musical repertoire which we might presume would serve Berg as a source for the title presents no obvious models. Reger does have a short piano piece entitled “Reigen,” but the most famous instances are both from the French tradition: Debussy’s Rondes de printemps (Images, 1905–09, published 1910) and the similarly entitled (khorovod) section of Stravinsky’s Le Sacre du printemps (1911–13, published in piano four-hand version 1913). Berg’s work owes nothing specific to these works, if indeed he knew much at all about them at this time.

More generally, the image of Spring and of dance formed a pervasive aesthetic conceit in fin-de-siècle arts and would have been very familiar to Berg through the Secession publication Ver sacrum [Sacred Spring], and, perhaps, through Wedekind’s earlier play Frühlings Erwachen [The Awakening of Spring] as well.* Most of these works, like Schnitzler’s Reigen, have as a central theme the relation between Eros and society, and collectively
they form the artistic counterpart to Freud’s psychoanalytical investigations. In fact, Freud communicated directly to Schnitzler concerning “the extensive concurrence which exists between your views and mine regarding some psychological and erotic problems.”

We know that Berg read Schnitzler’s play in the Summer of 1904 by the testimony of Frida Semler, who spent the Summers of 1903 and 1904 as a guest at the Berghof. According to ‘Miss Frida’, the other play which the young people read at the Berghof in 1904 was Wedekind’s Erdgeist [Earth Spirit] which, of course, later became the first part of the libretto for Lulu. The teenagers must have felt terribly avant-garde to be reading such erotically-charged literature. Pandora’s Box [Die Büchse der Pandora], Wedekind’s other Lulu play, was given a famous uncensored production by Karl Kraus the following year (28-05-1905) which Berg attended with his brother, Hermann, and which had both Schnitzler and Freud listed among its prominent patrons.

Berg had an ambivalent relation towards this aspect of Schnitzler as a celebrated ‘personality’. While he no doubt delighted in Kraus’s use of Schnitzler as a target in Die Fackel—Kraus’s satire of the way Schnitzler’s attendance at artistic events was treated as a kind of prize—Berg was, at the same time, guilty of the offense himself: he proudly reported to Schoenberg that Schnitzler was among the first to request advance tickets for a reprise performance of Gurrelieder; and, in 1915, Berg’s touch of satire does not gainsay his description of the valued presence of “the so-called ‘cream’: Schnitzler, Loos, etc.” at the concerts of the Schoenberg circle.

The evidence of Schnitzler’s diary shows that he was well aware of the Schoenberg circle. He found a display of Schoenberg’s paintings showed “unmistakable talent [Talent unverkennbar],” and he knew of Mahler’s support for the musical Schoenberg. Schnitzler was, himself, soon solicited
to come to Schoenberg's aid as a recipient of Berg's form letter of appeal during September of 1911, which preceded Alma Mahler's assistance in establishing a Schoenberg fund. Schnitzler responded with a small donation.¹⁴

We even know that Schnitzler was in attendance at the op.4 Skandalkonzert (31-03-1913), apparently sitting quietly in the second loge throughout the tumult. Schnitzler's own diaries (recently published) provide an additional account of the event:¹⁵


Schnitzler's diary entry shows that same detachment which also characterizes his play: fisticuffs in the concert hall, supper at the Imperial—without transition. He did not like Berg's music. His opinion of Berg's music remains consistent: the Altenberglieder are "silly"; much later he calls Schoenberg's principal pupils "talentless, foolish."¹⁶

Schnitzler's assessment of Berg's early music is recorded in his diaries. Berg's assessment of Schnitzler's literary work is not directly known. Berg's modern literary heroes were Wedekind, Altenberg, and Hauptmann, Ibsen and Strindberg, Balzac and Dostoyevsky—any of whose works, in comparison with those of Schnitzler, are more deeply wrapped in mythos, more profoundly occupied with existential issues. Schnitzler's characters are not archetypal, they are typical. The symbiotic quality which characterizes male-female relations in Reigen—and which today strikes us as the reason for its
relevance, its modernity—was as out of step with the emerging expressionist, psychological, and surrealist conceptualization of sexual relations as confrontation and conflict.\textsuperscript{17}

We can, however, get some sense of what Berg's 'official view' of Schnitzler's work might have been 'by proxy'. All members of the Schoenberg circle were avid readers of Kraus's satirical periodical \textit{Die Fackel}. Berg was a happy addict virtually from the time of the journal's inception.\textsuperscript{18} The same public release of \textit{Reigen} in 1903 which allowed Berg access to the work brought the following response from Kraus:\textsuperscript{19}

I take \textit{Reigen} for a work of art, it is a work of art just like the intimate art in the secret cabinet in Naples, but also like this, only a department of art, which does not open itself to everyman, to every woman. ... it will be sent into the house sealed up like the literature of men's secret drawers.

It was not the eroticism \textit{per se} which bothered Kraus, it was its reduced valuation, the absence of more profound pay-off, its merely journalistic impressionism. As he says in his dissenting celebration of Schnitzler's fiftieth birthday (1912):\textsuperscript{20}

when the time has been whiled away in this amorous fashion, nothing follows, and the beating of the heart is merely a physiological disturbance.

... Schnitzler's humour establishes no complications. Schnitzler now is looking up. But did the author of \textit{Reigen} perhaps hope to call forth great laughter, would he be able to look down from above onto humanity? Erotic psychology opens up a nutshell of knowledge which cannot aspire to aphorism, but only to sketch, whose technique stands above the Viennese Feuilleton and whose idea stands below the French dialogue.
But Berg had more compelling personal reasons to identify with Schnitzler’s work. We know that sometime early in 1902, Alban, the seventeen-year-old “Young Man” of the house, fathered an illegitimate daughter (Albine Scheuchl; born 04-12-1902) through a love affair with one of the family’s servants, Marie.21 “Marie”—though definitively common—is also the name of Schnitzler’s “Chamber Maid,” and, of course, of the central female character in Wozzeck (indeed, Schnitzler’s soldier is also called Franz).

According to Erich Berg, the composer’s nephew, Alban’s intimacies with Marie Scheuchl began in the last year of Conrad Berg’s life (1899–1900). She used to visit Alban in his room when his parents were out. Alban could, therefore, scarcely have read Schnitzler’s Reigen in 1904 without identifying strongly with the dramatic situation posed by the “Young Man” (Alfred) and the “Chamber Maid” (Marie) in Schnitzler’s third scene. “Alfred”?—one thinks also of the composer character “Alwa” in Lulu: Alfred, Alwa, Alban.

We also know, from the evidence of Berg’s personal notebooks [the Notizhefte] that he continued intermittently to see (and to support) his daughter Albine. And one of the notebooks (A-Wn F 21 Berg 479/57) consists, for the most part, of a list of books lent to various friends, students and family members. The same notebook (at fol. 59) contains a list of books loaned to Berg’s sister, Smaragda. The names “Strindberg” and “Dostojewskij” may be deciphered as well as the title “Reigen.” “Ver sacrum,” the publication of the Wiener Secession is also listed. The page is stamped with Berg’s Nußdorferstrasse 19 address and may, therefore, be dated between August of 1910 and the Fall of 1911. So we know that Reigen remained ‘in circulation’ long after Berg first read it in 1904.22

Berg’s personal copy of Schnitzler’s Reigen (the 1903 edition) remains in his library at Trauttmsdorffgasse 27. Several marginal highlights (vertical pencil strokes) perhaps shed some light on what Berg found
intuitively interesting. However, there is no way to establish the date of these annotations (or, in the absence of textual entries, even to be sure that they are Berg’s). Though it is hard to imagine that Berg the bibliophile would have failed to notice the new printing of Schnitzler’s Reigen (copies 59000 to 99000!) that appeared in 1914, there is no evidence that he acquired another copy at that time, nothing that establishes a direct link to Opus 6.

Indeed, as we conclude this section, it is readily acknowledged that there is no single document which unassailably links Schnitzler’s play and Berg’s piece. The discovery of any such document would not only have clinched the case, it would have spared both reader and writer much disproportionate discourse. (Circumstantial evidence makes for lengthy cases.) What we have found, however, is a continuous chain of reference to Schnitzler and/or to Reigen from the time we know Berg read the play in the Summer of 1904 until the time he sketched his own Reigen in the Summer of 1914.

In 1912 and 1913, Berg—as ever in emulation of both Schoenberg and Kraus—was himself “aspiring to aphorism,” in the Altenberglieder and the Clarinet Pieces. But at Schoenberg’s urging (after the Berlin visit of June 1913) Berg moved towards an orchestral project with larger and more richly thematic formal intentions. As he turned to sketch either a suite of character pieces, a symphony, or both, through the Summer of 1913, Berg already had an idea for an orchestral march in mind—sketch evidence suggests it had been seething subconsciously since 1912. The march did not coalesce, however, did not really come to life, until its ‘character’ became established early in 1914, when it became the Marsch eines Astmatikers.

The ‘symphony’ project was no doubt conceived as a more ‘abstract’ parallel undertaking to the suite. A ‘study’ which is now the Symphonie-Fragment was abandoned, but other materials intended for the introduction
to the symphony became transformed (in the Summer of 1914) into the prelude of the suite (the Präludium of Opus 6). Preludes, by definition, can be rather neutral, but Berg's Suite of Character Pieces was still left with only one character. He needed to find a way to imbue his projected "Waltz" with a quality of character that he could identify with as strongly as he identified the Marsch with his condition as an asthmatic.

Chance intervened. In the summer of 1914, as he completed the other two pieces of Opus 6 and continued to plan Reigen, Berg came across Wilhelm Fliess's Von Leben und Tod (Vienna, 1909). Fliess's numerological theories, which posited male biocycles of 23 and female biocycles of 28, synchronized with Berg's own fixation on 23. In a context predisposed to coincidence, it is a small leap from Fliess's male and female numbers, to the male and female dance partners of Berg's projected Waltz, and from there to the male and female 'characters' of Schnitzler's play. Berg's unavoidably powerful identification in 1904 with the situation of Schnitzler's Young Man and Chamber Maid forged a personal relationship with the play that would withstand whatever reservations he might later accrue concerning the social role or literary merit of its author. Given this personal history, and with Fliess as catalyst, it is, in short, unimaginable that Berg could have chosen the title Reigen in 1914 without noticing its allusion to Schnitzler's play. And, when we return to this programmatic context at the end of the chapter, we will find plenty of numerological coincidences and formal parallelisms that link Schnitzler's play and Berg's 'Charakterstück'.
**Documentary Introduction, part 2: musical documents for *Reigen***

On the musical documentary side, it is remarkable that there are very few extant sketches for *Reigen*. By 1915, perhaps Berg felt comfortable enough with the Opus 6 cycle that he could sketch this last-composed piece directly onto Particell-size pages, redoing those pages which were too error-laden to be salvageable. In any case, the Stadtbibliothek sketchbook (A–Wst 14.263/c), so central to our discussion of the *Praludium* in chapter 4, contains only four sketches for *Reigen*. And three of these are too highly tentative to warrant more than brief description here.

Page 25 of the sketchbook is the verso of 26, the page containing the formal sketch (A₁, B, C, D, etc.) which we associated with the *Praludium* at the ‘symphony stage’ of Berg’s conception for its design. Page 25 itself bears the title “A₁ immer leise” and, in stick-rhythm notation only, the unmistakable Nebenstimme (the delta motive) of *Reigen*’s opening, as well as a look at its potential for imitative treatment and perhaps a compressed hint of the Haupstimme rhythm (mm.6–7 at half values). Lower on the same page, Berg seems further to intuit the eventual shift to triple meter (given as 3/8 in the sketch). Annotations supporting this intuition constitute the only identifiable elements on page 44 of the same sketchbook: “der [sic] umgekehr[te] Mot[ive]” (presumably motive alpha) and “eventuell Walzer.” Similarly, page 28 (part of the loose subgathering of *Praludium* sketch pages used upside down) anticipates the formal idea of rhythmic-metric transition with its indication “. . von früher”; and the rhythmic profile of the first two measures of the Waltz idea (m.20) as well as the interlocking rhythmic pattern which accomplishes the transition from duple to triple meter are discernible.

The most significant sketch for *Reigen* is found on page 32. **Example 5.1** provides a facsimile, **Example 5.2** a transcription.
Example 5.1: Sketch for delta block-chordal idea in Reigen and Präludium.
(A-Wst MH 14.264/c, p.32, facsimile)
Example 5.2: Sketch for delta block-chordal idea in *Reigen* and *Preludium*.
(A-Wst MH 14.264/c, p.32; transcription of Ex.5.1)

Notes:
1. purple pencil; upper voice lighter, in most cases rest of chord heavily overtraced though original disposition of notes is maintained
2. D3 in this chord extremely faint
3. first chord heavily overtraced
4. alternative rhythmic intentions (revisions) possible as shown above
We will discuss this sketch (Examples 5.1 and 5.2) in considerable detail over the next few paragraphs. The sketch anticipates a formal idea, the occurrence of the cyclic-theme delta chordal progression in both the *Präludium* and *Reigen*. Lines 2 and 3 of the page show the progression as found in *Reigen* (mm. 4–6). Berg changed the spelling of the C in the penultimate chord to B# at the Particell stage. A D3 in the underbracketed final chord is extremely faint; the “extra note” Ab will be found in the register as sketched on beat 4 of measure 6 in the score, as well as in the Hauptstimme an octave higher at beat 1. Even as it appears in the sketch (i.e., minus the faint D) the final chord is the abstract inversional equivalent of the first chord (both are set-class [SC] 4–19 [0148]). The combination of the sketched chord with the Hauptstimme notes at m. 6 yields D–F–A–C#–E–G#(Ab).

This hexachord, and its complex of subsets, functions as *Reigen’s* structurally significant referential sonority. The hexachord is SC 6–19 [013478] [124589], in m.6 as <259148>; the most prominent subsets are 5–17 [01348] as <24914> and 4–19 [0148] as <2591> and <5914>. These (and other pc-set) relations are more fully developed in the analytical discussions below.

Lines 6 and 7 show the progression from the *Präludium* (mm. 44–46). Aside from differences in spelling, the first, third, sixth, and final chords differ from the version in the score in various ways. The first chord is a tone lower (T.2) than its sketched *Reigen* counterpart rather than a semitone lower (T.1). Furthermore, the chord is the inversional equivalent of its *Reigen* counterpart, SC 4–19 [0148] disposed as ‘augmented-major six-five’ chord <7B23> rather than as ‘minor-major six-five’ <8045>. Berg seems to be doing two things here: he explores the inversional equivalence (TnI) potential of SC 4–19 in a preliminary way, and—via the aberrant transposition level of the first chord—he emphasizes E-flat in the sketch (rather than the E-natural of the *Präludium* score). Such TnI equivalence of 4–19s is not exploited in the
m.44ff parenthetic passage of the Präludium; as we shall see below, however, such an inversional equivalence relationship is the best way to account for the 'subordinate theme' referential sonority in Reigen (m.36, m.56; see Figure 5.8(g) below)—in fact, that sonority is the same pc-set (237B) as the chord that begins sketch line 6. The emphasis on pc3 (Eb) itself, however—also seen solo on line 9 of the sketch—reminds us that the foreshadowing of cyclic-theme delta in the Präludium occurs precisely following the return of the reiterated Eb 'Hauptrhythmus' (mm. 42–44).

The third chord on sketch line 6 is a mechanical transposition of its Reigen-sketch (line 2) counterpart; in the score of the Präludium, however, the chord becomes a 'diminished seventh': this permits the inner- and upper-voice reiterations of G–A-flat (or G-sharp) that are a significant contextual feature of the voice-leading of the passage (mm. 44–46). The reverse situation obtains in the sixth chord: here it is the Reigen chord (in both sketch and score) which proceeds in a smooth voice-leading wedge (the upper voice downward, the lower three voices upward) from the preceding chord. The Präludium chord (sketch lines 6–7) is not its mere transposition. The Reigen chord instances SC 4–24 [0248] as <B137>; the Präludium chord sketched below it is a 'French sixth', 4–25 [0268], a rearrangement of chord four. In the Präludium score this chord is set-class equivalent to its Reigen counterpart (i.e., it is also SC 4–24, though as <6A82>), but the spacing and voice leading differ: in particular, the lower voice goes down to the Ab3, which note also happens to appear in this sketch.25

The final chord of lines 6–7 is a mechanical transposition of its Reigen sketch counterpart. In the Präludium score the line concludes with the melodic tone D4 and the final interval is a falling minor third rather than a perfect fourth seen here. The score version of course better matches the [014] tag of the Präludium's "A2" interjection, a tag that returns at this point (m.46)
as a significant gesture of structural framing. The ‘E-flat minor triad’ which (in the Präludium score, m.46) occurs beneath that D4, and which forms with it SC 4–19 [0148], recalls again the otherwise anomalous 4–19 chord (in its ‘augmented inverted’ form) which begins line 6 on this sketch page, and which is also attached to an E-flat.

At this point, I should apologize for wallowing in such minutiae and remove us to higher ground. The point is that these sketches show in a remarkable way Berg’s combination of pre-meditative (even mechanical) formal-conceptual ideas with subtle (and perhaps largely intuitive) variants of detail. Sometimes the changes appear to be made for reasons of voice-leading, sometimes for reasons of retaining an associated vertical sonority; sometimes these changes surface only in the score, sometimes a more complex chain of compositional revision takes place from sketch to sketch to score. On the whole, there has been, in the professional literature, minimal discussion of significant differences between statements of the “same” motive (here the important delta-chords theme), as if the recognition of "family resemblance"—admittedly no mean task in itself for much of Opus 6—were a sufficient analytical result. Yet a careful assessment of such variant detail is fundamental to a more thorough understanding of both compositional process and product.

In closing this documentary introduction, the detailed examination of this sketch raises three issues worth emphasis:

(1) The page shows that Berg conceived the delta-chord passage at its Reigen pitch level first, and that he derived the Präludium foreshadow from it, incorporating a number of subtle changes both at the sketch stage and in Particell and score. It is, therefore, apparent that the cyclic role of theme delta was established quite early in the compositional process.
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Analytical Discussion: Blocks, Chains, and Cycles

Before we begin our three analytical tacks of block, chain, and cycle, it is useful to have a compass. Much of the thematic content of Reigen is anticipated in the cyclic-motivic complex (alpha-beta-gamma and delta) that first appears near the end of the Präludium, as shown in Example 5.3:

Example 5.3: Cyclic Motives alpha-beta-gamma & delta

Annotations to the example emphasize: the generative 014 trichordal cells in alpha; the 014s (circled) and 016s ('triangulated') in beta; also the tetrachordal components 4–29 [0137] over 4–13 [0136] in beta, and the progressions by interval-cycle segments—see the ic5, ic4, and ic3 (all over ic1) in gamma; and the ic3 (E–C#–Bb–to–G) in delta. The example also emphasizes the tetrachordal harmonies of motive delta: seventh-chord types—4–19 [0148], 4–27 [0258], and 4–28 [0369] (changed to 4–18 [0147] in Reigen); and wholetone subcollection types—4–25 [0268], 4–24 [0248], and 4–21 [0246]. Alternating wholetone subcollections derived from the projection of parallel major thirds or augmented trichords also govern the subsurface of motives alpha-beta-gamma. Now to our blocks, chains, and cycles.
Berg's orchestral imagination and orchestral skill is phenomenal, especially in creating orchestral blocks, by which I mean balancing the orchestra in several polyphonic planes. One of the most remarkable noises he ever imagined is at bar 89 in Reigen . . . .

The preceding quotation, from Stravinsky's Conversations (1959, 73), provides the entry point into our rubric blocks. We will approach the "remarkable noise" of the orchestral block at m.89 through an examination of its immediate predecessors, the blocks at m.79 and m.83. The first is given in Example 5.4:
Example 5.4 shows that the block at m.79 is the fragmentary remnant of, the liquidation of, a brief recollection of Waltz material. A two-measure beta-gamma-derived model (m.73) is continued sequentially (m.75); its last motivic segment is then fragmented (m.77) and two repetitions of the fragment (m.79 and m.81) achieve a kind of ‘cinematographic fade’ into the General Pause of m.82. It is recommended that the reader now take a moment to review aurally that effect in the passage from m.73 to the G.P.

The initial tetrachord of the model (mm.73–74) is 4–29 [0137], of the sequence (mm.75–76) 4–13 [0136]; we recall that these set-classes formed the upper and lower voices, respectively, of cyclic motive beta (Example 5.3, above), which has here been deconstructed into a thematic succession. The tail of the model (motive gamma, m.74) foreshadows the broader whole-tone partitioning which soon takes over the texture.

This takeover produces the real ‘orchestral block’ of this passage, heard most clearly in the four fluttertongued (flzg.) and four widely oscillating (osc.) dyads of the accompanying parts in mm.77 through 81. As the annotation to Ex.5.4 (on the next page) shows, all dyads form interval classes of the whole-tone collection; six of the eight are tritones (ic6). The vertical combination of dyads into tetrachords produces set-class 4–13 [0136] as <82+B9> in m.77; this can be understood as a fragmented replacement for a further sequencing of the 4–13 beta motive from m.75 (at T4) which would have produced <928B> in m.77. Thereafter, the dyads combine to form whole-tone tetrachords: 4–25 [0268] and 4–21 [0246]. Though the motivic detail of the Hauptstimme is considerably more complicated (note, for example its ‘two-voice’ registral partitioning in mm.77–78), it too eventually liquidates into an alternation of whole-tone subcollections in the bass of mm.79–81: <2A08> <B(6)59> (note the [014] tag), and <842> <39B57>.

Example 5.5 shows what follows after the General Pause.
Annotation to Ex.5.4: dyadic partitioning of accompaniment, mm.77–81.

- m.77 m.78
- m.79 m.81
- B9 4A (4–6)
- 71 06 (4–9)
- 82 06 (4–25)
- 3B 4A (4–8)
- 4–13 4–25
- [0136] [0268]
- 4–21 4–25
- [0246] [0268]
- (cf. beta) wt1
- wt1 w10

Example 5.5: 'Polyphonic planes' of orchestral blocks.

Block 1 (mm.83–88)
Block 2: (mm.89–94)

Annotation to Ex.5.5: summary of pitch(-class) motions in the two blocks.

block 1, mm.83–88
1: A364 to 79B13(4)
2: 2(4) w10, T0(#1)
3: B(ic2) over 2(ic1)6
4: beta 59.48.59
5: [bscf 04.15.04.(15)]

block 2, mm.89–94
1: B975 to 8A0246
2: 13 wt1, T+4/8(#1)
3: 1(ic2)5 over 4(ic1)8
4: beta 04.15.04
5: vn2 soli
Example 5.5: The orchestral block beginning at m.83 consists of five distinct 'polyphonic planes'; the orchestral block beginning at m.89—the "remarkable noise"—is derived from it. Note that the example shows the content of each plane without precise regard to alignment; annotations summarize the pitch-class content and derivation of each plane. The motivic content of planes 1 and 2 is derived from the second idea of the Subordinate Theme (m.37), the content of plane 3 from its third idea (m.38): here, they are presented \textit{en bloc}.$^{16}$

Plane 5 doesn't actually exist: this bass clarinet part is found in Berg's Particell (A-Wn F 21 Berg, fol.12v) and persisted through the 1923 edition of the score, but it was deleted in Berg's 1929 revision and is not found in the present edition (©1954). Yet this documentary remnant helps corroborate analytical understanding of the passage: block 1 is based on an alternation of whole-tone collections represented by augmented trichords \<048> and \<159>; the F-A third in plane 4, which is hung out to dry at the end of the passage, would be joined by the next third "due" in the missing bass clarinet part, namely \<C#-F>. Both would then serve as a link to the wt1 subcollection which begins block 2.

A summary of the pitch-class motions and transpositional derivations of the two blocks is given in the \textit{annotation} below the example. \textbf{Block 1:} Plane 1 shifts from wt0 to wt1, from \<A864> to \<79B13>; contextually, therefore, the C-natural has an appoggiatura-like articulative function, and the final E-natural sets up the repetition of wt0. The combination of planes 4 and 5 effects a similar shift via trichords \<048> and \<159>; note how the initial minor third \<47> of motive beta is "corrected" in the lower-neighbouring (LN) major third \<48>.$^{27}$ The main content of plane 3 is a downward progression by wholetones (ic2) within the wt1 collection (B down to D#) against an upward progression by semitones (ic1) within the wt0
collection <D up to F#>. The whole texture is underpinned by the trill on D (pc2) that begins plane 2, before that plane moves to a T6 imitation of plane 1.

**Block 2:** A T-minus-1 transposition of plane 2 begins with a trill on Db (pc1), while plane 1 is a T-plus-1 transposition of its previous incarnation; thus, both shift from wt0 to wt1, but in opposite directions: this contributes to the sense of "widening" perceived in this second block. For plane 3, the T2 choice of transposition allows its upper voice to begin on C# (matching the initial pc of the trill); the widening of this plane is accomplished through its redisposition from the interior of the texture in block 1 to the registral extrema in block 2. Finally, the T-minus-5 transposition of the beta motive of plane 4 seems calculated to hold pcs 4 and 5 invariant while replacing the lower-neighbouring thirds of block 1 with the upper-neighbouring thirds of block 2, so that the final extended upward semitonal motion of block 2 'dissolves' into a recapitulation of the Waltz theme at m.94. And this with the same upper-voice pitch-class succession as was found in the initial presentation of the Waltz (at m.20). In the returning theme, pcs <4 and 5> are subtended collaterally by <0 and 1>: perhaps the final legacy of that deleted bass clarinet part (04, 15)! The reader would now profit from a rehearing of the two blocks in succession: note the 'cinematographic flicker' of block 1 (mm.83-88) and the 'cut' with which it terminates, the 'flutter and wow' of expanded block 2 (m.89ff) and its 'dissolve' into the Waltz recapitulation.

A different kind of orchestral block is found in the opening measures of the piece. (See Example 5.6 on the next page.) Here, the balancing of the orchestra in polyphonic planes is replaced by a planing block chordal progression. We have already dealt with the set-class structure of this delta chordal progression in some detail in conjunction with the sketch reproduced and transcribed in Examples 5.1 and 5.2.
Example 5.6: Main Theme block A1. Planing block chordal progression delta.

- In the main theme, "delta" is introduced through a chordal progression.
- The incipit to "delta" is marked as (a) introduction.
- The progression 4-19 [0148] is projected as Main Theme.
- The "delta" appears in (b) presentation with a 'delta shapnel'.
- In (c) continuation, "basic idea" and "continuation" are noted.
- Referential sonority is marked with "D2 ... to D3 (m.14)."
- Transition involves "delta structural framing".
- Cadential idea is marked with "beta ... hn pair".
In Example 5.6, attention is drawn to the way that the pitches of the initial tetrachord, 4–19 [0148] <4580>, gradually become projected through the block progression as the Hauptstimme introductory element labelled (a). At m.6, when the bass moves from C# to D, melodic element (b) begins a more regularized thematic statement, a 'presentation' function with a repeated one-and-half-measure 'basic idea' (for oboe, echoed by high bassoon) that is subjected to imitative dialogue (in horn). However, this is more than simple imitation at the fifth below; it is also symmetric inversion about the initial dyad, E–F: the projection of E–F–G/Ab–C is reflected in F–E–Db/C–A.

It is important to recognize the surface subtleties which result from the projection of the initial block chord. Ideas (a) and (b) "compose-out" the opening chord. Thus, the notes B4 and A4 in mm.6 and 8 are understood contextually as passing tones. The Ab4 and G4 engage in a more subtle interplay: the Ab, as the member of the projected chord, is understood as the main tone; the structural function of the G is to reintroduce the C5; though, on the surface, the G is slurred to the first subdivision of the phrase and, in conventional tonal terms appears more stable. This G–C motion borrows the qualities of articulative tonal strength that seem a property such rising fourths. The subsequent descent to Ab in the repetition of the basic idea actually stops there (m.8); the G on the last quarter of the measure belongs to the beginning of the next phrase, element (c).

This "stability interplay" of Ab/G—a similar interaction informs Db4/C4 in the imitations—maintains the melodic projection of the initial tetrachord, 4–19 [0148] <4580>, but also introduces the possibility of a perfect-fourth space, G4–C5 <70>. The latter will be splendidly realized as the central dyad in a complete ic5 statement of the aggregate (from F#2 to C#7) at the climax of the piece (m.66); and it will also be attenuated in the final two
measures, where a connection between bass note G1/G2 and the lower note of the final dyad (C5–E5) is intimated, again with all its quasi-tonal charms.

Returning to m.9 of Example 5.6, we see that the Hauptstimme shows 'continuation function' in the fragmentary and sequential aspects of element (c), and that it invokes cadential (and liquidating) functions in element (d), mm.12–14. (These elements will be strikingly transformed upon their return in mm.49–55—a situation that has programmatic implications, though it is also perfectly explicable in technical terms). The cadential idea itself moves from Eb5 through Bb4 (perhaps to Ab4, as at m.56) and, liquidating into the textural depths, arrives on the dyad D3–F# at the beginning of the Transition, m.14. Remarkably, this too might be construed as a projection of SC 4–19 \[\text{[0148]} \] as \(<3...A...62>\). Note, also, that the downbeat of m.13 contains the same pc-set within SC 5–21 \[\text{[01458]} \] \(<B+36A2>\), the same pentachordal SC with which the piece begins.

Meanwhile, the bass voice of the section 'unfolds' from C#3 to C#2 and then moves to D2 at m.6 (the arrival of the referential sonority); the D then creeps upwards chromatically to D3 at the beginning of the Transition (m.14). This 'coupling' of Ds might be segmented in several ways: the changes in surface activity suggest a conventional ic3 division \(<258B2>\) is possible; on the other hand, the motion D–F–A–C# (again SC 4–19) has merit since it is also expressed vertically in the referential sonority at the beginning of the motion (m.6).

The last point brings us to a discussion of the quasi-tonal properties inherent in this opening block progression. Some observations are summarized in Example 5.7:
Example 5.7: Opening block chords and referential sonority

Example 5.7(a) reconsiders the first two chords as an extension of familiar late-chromatic common-tone neighbouring configurations. Examples 5.7(b) and 5.7(c) show how the connection between the first chord and the chord in m.6 could be contained within the purview of triadic tonality as described in Schoenberg's *Harmonielehre* through the "addition of the dominant root" A. However, as Bruce Archibald has aptly put it, the chord in m.6 is "not a point of rest but a point of reference (1968, 77)."

Example 5.7(d) examines this referential sonority more closely. Taken as a whole, we find septachord 7-21 [0124589]. Without the (slightly delayed) C5 we have 6-19 [013478]. The lower pentachord is 5-17 [01348] <25914>. SC 5-17 is also the referential sonority of Schoenberg's *Farben*, op.16, no.3; Example 5.7(e) makes the comparison explicit.

Returning to Example 5.7(d) we note that both upper pentachords of Berg's referential sonority are 5–21s [01458]; thus, 5–21, the initial pentachord of *Reigen*, is literally embedded in the complete referential sonority at m.6, its 7-21 complement. The Example also highlights three embeddings of 4–19 [0148] and the two augmented trichords, <048> and <159>. Locally, the <048>
trichord provides a reverticalized framework for the projected Hauptstimme; the \( <159> \) trichord emerges from the referential sonority in the alpha-beta accompaniment figure. Globally, we recall these trichords from our discussion of the orchestral blocks; structural aspects of those blocks are thus subtly prefigured in this partitioning of the referential sonority itself.

The initial chords, the referential sonority (at m.6), and their prominent subsets recur at structurally significant junctures throughout the piece. In Figure 5.4, the design of Reigen is diagrammed as a succession of blocks with traditional formal roles. These formal blocks, are reinforced by harmonic blocks: the complex of recurrent referential sonorities shown in Example 5.8. (The Figure and the Example are placed together on the next page.)

Each “new” formal block in the columns of Figure 5.4 is dropped a line, so that formal recurrences may be read across the rows. Abbreviations for the formal functions of the sections and brief descriptions of their contents are provided below the diagram. To summarize, the Figure shows the following succession of formal blocks:

Main Theme (A1) as introduction (mm.1–13), Transition (mm.14–20), Waltz (W1) (mm.20–32), Subordinate Theme (B1) (mm.33–39), Main Theme reprise (A2) (mm.42–55), Subordinate Theme reprise (B2) (mm.56–68), Middle Theme (C; but a transformation of the referential sonority of the main theme, hence also A3) (mm.69–82), Subordinate theme reprise (B3) in two successive orchestral blocks (mm.83–88 and 89–94), Waltz reprise (W2) (mm.94–105), Retransition (mm.105–110), and Main Theme (A4) as Coda (mm.111–121).
Figure 5.4: Formal Design of Berg's *Reigen* as a series of formal blocks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT</th>
<th>Tr</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>ST</th>
<th>MT... ...</th>
<th>ST</th>
<th>MidT</th>
<th>ST... ...</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>Retr</th>
<th>MT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A₁ 'intro'</td>
<td>Tr</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>B₁</td>
<td>A₂</td>
<td>B₂</td>
<td>C(A₃)</td>
<td>B₃ (blocks)</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>Retr</td>
<td>A₄ 'coda'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m.1,6,9,12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20,24</td>
<td>33,36</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Abbreviations for formal functions (and brief descriptions of content):

MT = main theme (delta Nebenstimme, alpha-derived Hauptstimme, alpha-beta-gamma emerging in accompaniment); Tr = transition (beta based, with structural-framing delta), W = waltz (recasts motives of main theme in 3/4 meter, enlivening as alpha-beta-gamma at m.24), ST = subordinate theme (whole-tone ic2/ic6 based Hauptstimme, tertial-chained ic3/ic4 based Nebenstimme; reworked in m.56 and blocks mm.83 and 89), MidT = middle theme (brusque contrasting middle idea derived from T₁ of MT referential sonority, m.6), Retr = retransition (structural-framing delta coupled with its inversional variant; return to common meter). Overall, the form, based on reference to traditional models, is rondo-like; which is what one might expect from a 'Reigen' (round dance). Mm.73 (Waltz sequence), 105 (Retransition), and 111 ('coda' return of 'intro' delta and 4/4 meter) are selective in their recapitulatory functions. M.66, the quartal climax (ic5 aggregate): though loosely related to the initial and final sonorities, this chord appears otherwise to lie 'outside' the form.

Example 5.8: Harmonic Blocks, recurrent referential sonorities

(a) MT - A₁, m 1
(b) MT - A₂, m 42
(c) MidTh C - (A₃), m 026
(d) Coda - A₄, m 111

(e) climax
(f) end pos
(g) hanging beta
(h) 11-vo chord
(i) ic5 aggregate
(j) 11-vo chord
(k) ic5 aggregate
(l) ic5 aggregate
(m) ic5 aggregate
(n) ic5 aggregate

M.66 - the quartal climax (ic5 aggregate): though loosely related to the initial and final sonorities, this chord appears otherwise to lie 'outside' the form.
The broad outlines of this proposed subdivision are fairly compatible with the views of the form posited by Mark DeVoto (1980, 102) and Bruce Archibald (1989, 117, Figure 2) which were mentioned earlier. DeVoto's generalized "archform" may be read as the near-palindrome between the Ws of my Figure, though the return of the main theme at m.42 must be balanced against the contrasting Middle Theme at m.69. Archibald's "sonata form" matches my layout with respect to its assessment of main and subordinate thematic ideas, and in its recognition of introduction and coda functions.

However, other aspects of adopting a sonata-form template strike me as problematic. The opening 19 measures are in 2/2 time, the coda in 4/4; it is therefore tempting to read the Waltz (m.20) as the Exposition proper and its return in m.94 as the Recapitulation (cf. Archibald 1989, 117, Figure 2). This, however, puts the Waltz "recapitulation" disproportionately late in the structure and leaves the orchestral-block versions of the subordinate theme recapitulating before the main theme itself, without the tonal associations and inter-thematic similarities that such reorderings normally involve. Furthermore, the Subordinate Theme (m.33ff), after its initial functional ambivalence (mm.33–34 serves both as a liquidation of the preceding Waltz and as an introduction to the subordinate theme section, as we shall see shortly), soon loses the waltz (or Ländler) character and, in its later incarnations (m.56ff, and the blocks at m.83 and m.89) largely obscures the triple meter altogether.

Archibald places the beginning of the "development section" of his proposed sonata structure at m.45, just after the return of the referential sonority and main theme in m.42. Though such a placement underplays the sense of reprise, there are of course numerous precedents for such "tonic" openings for development sections, where apparent return is followed by new departure (familiar classical examples include the first movements of
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thematic idea and the continuational sequence of the Waltz (m.73) (recall Example 5.4). The other pair of main-theme elements—delta over C# (Ex.5.8(d))—recurs at section A4, a Coda that begins at m.111 without further reference to the original Hauptstimme.

The harmonic blocks found at m.66 and at the end of the piece (see Example 5.8(e) and (f)) can also be related to the opening sonorities. At m.66, the bass note C#(pcl) is redisposed as the highest pitch of a climactic twelve-note chord of stacked fourths (from F#2 up to C#7); the anomalous character of this quartal sonority makes it appear to lie “outside” the form (though we have already noted its precedent in the perfect-fourth space of the basic idea of the main theme, and we will deal with its programmatic implications later on). At the end of the work, pcl(as Db) introduces, but is absent from, an eleven-pc chord; the disposition of the chord partially recalls the tertial design of the m.6 referential sonority, but actually incorporates a myriad of summary partitioning schemes (some shown by the brackets in the Example); from that chord emerges the “hanging beta” with which the work concludes (also shown in the Example).

Returning to Figure 5.4, we note that the Transition (mm.14-20), though metrically part of the introduction, has a formal function and harmonic character quite distinct from the Main Theme which precedes it. The Transition is based on a looser sequential design and employs alpha-beta-gamma motives with an underlying beta framework (for horn pair, in T4 and upward chromatic transpositions) that is designed to arrive at the Waltz (in m.20), the metrical transition assisted by interlocking rhythmic fragments and a structural-framing statement of delta.28 The Retransition (mm.105–111)—though it now leads out of, rather than into, the reprised Waltz section (m.94ff)—is cleverly based on the same rhythmic fragment that was found in the Transition and also features a structural-framing statement of delta,
though combined with its inversional form (delta-2; this will be shown in Example 5.11, below). Finally, the Ws in Figure 5.4 indicate the Waltz sections themselves (mm.20 and 94, also m.73): though derived from the cyclic motives, these sections function as independent formal blocks; we will discuss their associated harmonic blocks later on (Example 5.10, below).

Before leaving the topic of formal and harmonic blocks, attention is drawn to the Subordinate Theme (B1) which sneaks in at m.33 but is clearly underway by m.36. Its associated harmonic block (see Example 5.8(g)) features a different form of 4–19 [0148]: an Eb augmented seventh chord. Intriguingly, this is the form of 4–19 found on the lower system of that early delta sketch (recall Examples 5.1 and 5.2, line six, first chord). Above this 4–19 in Ex.5.8(g), we find a [026] whole tone-subset trichord (as Bb–Ab–E). The ST formal block also recurs at m.56 (section B2) and as the big orchestral blocks (which together are formal block B3). (In B3, the [0148] referent is absent, and the [026] trichord is expanded to whole tone tetrachordal and pentachordal subcollections; recall Example 5.5, above.) Like the Main Theme, the Subordinate Theme, though more looseknit, consists of a chaining together of four elements with traditional Schoenbergian formal functions. But this brings us to our next rubric—chains.
Chains

[Berg] fused the art of thematic manipulation ... with the principle of continuous transition. ... from each theme a remnant [ein Rest] is retained, ever smaller, until finally only a vanishingly small vestige remains; not only does the theme establish its own insubstantiality, but the formal interrelationships between successive sections are woven together with infinitesimal care.

The preceding quotation is from Adorno’s Alban Berg: Master of the smallest link (1991, 3). We recall Berg’s use of motivic linkage—specifically through motive beta and shifting whole tone subcollections—in the joining together of the orchestral blocks at m.83 and m.89. Linkage technique (first identified by Schenker) occurs when the last idea in a formal unit (here a phrase or block) becomes the first idea of the next one. For Berg, linkage technique is not only a means of connecting thematic and formal blocks, it is also a method for their construction. Example 5.9 (on the next page) shows how motives are chained together to construct the Subordinate Theme. Its four elements are labelled (a)(b)(c)(d) in the example. Idea (a) has double function: it serves both as the liquidation of the preceding Waltz section and, retrospectively, as the introduction to this one. As is apparent, the last idea of (a) is compressed to form the first idea of (b), the last idea of (b) is expanded to form the first idea of (c), and—less superficially—the whole subcollection which underlies the end of (c), <79x13B>, is inverted, as <89x7x5B3>, in cadential idea (d). The designation “Harmonie” is from Berg’s Particell (fol.9); the chords are rhythmically activated in the score and the familiar 4–19 [0148] (in its augmented major seventh chord configuration) drops into place as the local referential sonority at m.36.
The Nebenstimme on the middle staff of m.37, a quintessentially Bergian violin arpeggio, is perhaps best understood as a chaining together of two 4-19 tetrachords framed by two [026] trichords. The section is liquidated by treating a wt1 pentachord (5–33 [02468]) as a quasi leading-tone chord in order to return to the original referential sonority (7–21 [0124589], "ref. son.") for the beginning of section A2 at m.42.
If Berg uses linkage technique to construct themes, he also uses what we might call ‘un-linkage technique’ to deconstruct them. I refer not to the ‘vanishing vestiges’ described by Adorno but to Berg’s free exploitation of the principles of multiple counterpoint. For example, the two big orchestral blocks presented Subordinate Theme motives en bloc that were originally successive. In the Waltz fragment that introduced these blocks the opposite situation obtained: the set-classes of its model and sequence matched those of the upper and lower voices of motive beta. Thus, this situation rendered successive what was formerly combined.

Example 5.10 (on the next page) shows that the harmonies which begin the original Waltz section (m.20ff) are obtained from a similar deconstruction of motive beta. A stylized oom-pah accompanies the ‘waltzified’ 014 cell.

This oom-pah is formed from the lower voice (SC 4–13 [0136] as <A170>) of the hypothetical “beta” motive shown to the left of m.20 on the Example; the harmony of m.21 is then formed from its upper voice (SC 4–29 [0137] as <2814>). The whole pattern is then chained sequentially a minor third higher (mm.22–23) before returning to its original level (an octave lower) beneath the “etwas belebend, alpha 3rds” at m.24. The T3 transposition of the harmony at m.22 of course simply follows the [014]-based waltz melody, but it also results in a partial enlargement of lower-voice beta, <A170>: <A170> in m.20 becomes <14A3> in m.22; the next ‘due’ pcs, 7 and 0 (G and C), are then subsumed into both the harmony and the leading idea when the alpha-3rds take over in m.24.
Shown in such fashion, this derivation of the Waltz harmony from an unlinking of beta seems entirely straightforward—indeed obvious—but it certainly eluded this analyst for some time! I think the reason for this is that it seems counter-intuitive to view the lower voice of beta as an independent entity. Once one has made this leap, it is possible—particularly, if armed with a set-theoretic perspective—to recognize Berg’s independent use of beta’s lower-voice SC 4–13 in Waltz passages, as we have already seen in Example 5.4 (the recollected waltz block; SC 4–13 in the upper-voice sequence at m.75 and then, more abstractly, in the accompanying dyadic pairs at m.77).
In this context, it is instructive to compare Bruce Archibald’s quite incisive description of the Transition (mm.14–20) with his then rather convoluted attempt at deriving the Waltz harmonies from the same motive (Archibald 1968, 77–82; also 1989, 114). Berg first intimates the split of the beta voices at the beginning of the Transition when horn 1 and 2 present them in overlapping (out-of-phase) arpeggios, a gesture which Archibald correctly asserts is “the foundation and unifying force” of the passage (1968, 80). As Archibald shows, the horn pair begins from the dyad D3–F#3 in m.14, is transposed T4 to F#–Bb at m.16 (with Bb2 subtended in the bass), and then creeps upward chromatically until the Waltz begins in m.20.

We can now see that the ‘de-synchronization’ of the beta motive voices and the T4 transposition of its initial dyad come to their logical end at the beginning of the Waltz. It is a further T4 transposition, in fact, the next one “due”: Transition (m.14) D–F# to F#–Bb (m.16) to Waltz (m.20) beta split as SC 4–13 on Bb, followed by SC 4–29 on D. And this final T4 results in the splitting of the voices into the alternating harmonies of the Waltz. Thus, the “hypothetical” beta motive to the left of m.20 in my Example 5.10 turns out to be not-so-hypothetical after all. Perhaps more significantly, this waltz-initiating motive returns—at the same pitch level and properly en bloc—as the final hanging beta gesture of the entire piece.

From a form-functional (rather than a contrapuntal-textural) perspective, the complement to linkage is not ‘un-linkage’ but ‘structural framing’: the reference to initial material at the close of a formal unit. This framing role is performed particularly by cyclic motive delta. For example, it returns at the end of the transition to frame out the introduction, dissolving in a beautiful metric modulation across the Waltz border (m.20); the same motive sneaks back into the texture to mark the récapitulation of the Waltz.
(m.94) and also frames the main body of the piece with its return at the Coda (section A4, m.111).

**Example 5.11** illustrates a more complex and subtle situation. As is shown on the middle staff of the Example, the recapitulated Waltz (its presentation function was at m.94) continues briefly at m.98 with its alpha thirds and follows with fragmented liquidations of gamma. Meanwhile, the outer registers show inversionally related statements of delta.

**Example 5.11: "Structural Framing" by delta at Retransition**

Delta-2, the rising form of that cyclic motive, is a harbinger of closure (a function which we will also find it performs in the Marsch); delta-1, the normal descending form, is here calculated at a transpositional level that will allow it to arrive on A2 for the quasi-dominant pedal (marked "V" on the Example) which begins the Retransition proper (m.105). The two deltas are "out of phase." But as the annotation at the top right of the Example shows, in "first species" reduction they form a series of inversionally-related dyads of
sum 3 (i.e., they have an index of inversion of 3). The axis dyad (pcs 1 and 2) of this relation encapsulates the conflict between C# and D with which the work began. The idea which, in m.102, follows the delta-2 statement plays with similar inversionally-symmetrical dispositions around E4 and F4; the reader will also recall that dyadic pair from opening of the piece. In m.105, the clarinet in A begins the Retransition proper with a restatement of delta-2 in confirmation of the D minor allusions.

My Example 5.11 shows the delta-2 statement at m.105 at the pitch-level found in the Particell. However, in the autograph score (US–NYpm Lehman collection), Berg begins the statement from G3 rather than C#4, i.e., a tritone lower than in the Particell! Subsequent scores including the faircopy (US–NYpm Cary collection), correction proofs for the 1923 edition (A-Wn F 21 Berg 142), the 1923 edition itself, the revised score (A-Wn F 21 Berg 141), and the current edition (©1954) also begin the idea from G3. I have never been particularly comfortable with the pitch-level in the score, because the B-natural on beat 4 of m.105 strikes me as unexpected, indeed, rather ugly—one can still think such things with more confidence in Reigen than in the Marsch!—and the subsequent A4 on the downbeat of m.106 matches the pitch-class of the bass for no particular reason, rather than the pitch (Eb5) at the top of the horn chord (C#4−G4−Bb4−Eb5): a new pitch, and a change from E-natural, which the Particell version of the tail of the clarinet line, as F5−E5−Eb5, properly serves to introduce.

I think what happened is this: Berg, in working with both Eb and A clarinets, transposed the concert pitch of the Particell down a third as if for Eb clarinet, rather than up a third for A clarinet. (The Particell specifies "C1 in A"). In itself, this is not remarkable; what is striking is that neither Berg nor his very capable team of proofreaders ever caught the discrepancy and corrected the later editions of the score, or, alternatively, changed the Particell
to match the score. In any case, they may not have noticed: the tritone discrepancy is less outrageous than might appear, since the chord projected in m.102 is a complete dominant eleventh with minor ninth; i.e., it has two tritones, C#-G and E-Bb, that would be preserved under T6.

The crux of the matter is that this summary, structural-framing statement of cyclic theme delta-2 is more effective over the A pedal when, as in the Particell, it begins from C#4 and ends with the Eb5 at the top of the horn chord. This revision would also fit into a broader pattern of registral transfer: the delta-2 idea first entered on C#5 at m.97; as revised, it would be restated on C#4 by the clarinet in m.105 (both statements are shown in Example 5.11); a variant for trombone (not shown) then follows on C#3 in m.106, and the harp finishes the process in m.107, on C#2 (and C#1).

Ultimately, cyclic theme delta (as the delta-1 block chordal progression of the opening) returns to mark the beginning of the coda (m.111); but it also serves as the structural framing idea for the entire work: an enlarged statement of delta-1 beginning from C#3 (as Db3, in m.115) embeds compressed statements of delta-2 (also beginning from C#3; cf. Jarman 1979, 45, Ex.47), and, as the motive plays out, it reaches Db2 before dropping to the G1 bass note of the closing chord. In the "hanging beta" motive of the final two measures, this delta chain has become unlinked: we step out of the structural frame.

This reference to the "chaining off" or structural framing role of cyclic theme delta brings us to our last rubric—cycles.
There are still other ways of approaching the shape of these pieces. Their goal ... is the large form. That is why they define that form by means of "characters". [Adorno (1991), p.75]

As we said at the outset, four "characters" appear throughout Opus 6, namely cyclic motives alpha, beta, gamma, and delta. The delta idea leads off in Reigen as the atmospheric opening block chordal progression. We have already dealt with the structural-framing role played by motive delta in both its downward (delta-1) and upward (delta-2) variants, a role which we will see it reprise in the Marsch). Motive alpha in its cellular prototype underlies the introductory idea of the main theme (mm.1-6) and the whole alpha-beta-gamma chain emerges in the tenor register from the referential sonority in m.6. Again, in its cellular form, motive alpha is transformed into the basic idea of the Waltz theme (m.20) and, in its more lively doubled thirds version, alpha becomes the continuation of the Waltz in m.24 (etwas belebend) and is followed by the beta-gamma model-sequence of mm.26 and 30.

The Subordinate Theme, on the other hand, provides substantial constrast to such cyclic-motivic dependency. It takes the interval cycle segments which are implicit in the main-theme block and renders them explicit. Consider Example 5.12, the return of the Subordinate Theme as formal block B2, m.56.
The section shows three different interval-cycle types: ic2 (wholetone), ic3/4 (mixed thirds), and ic5 (perfect fourths); each of which—in an incidental and metaphorical fashion—recalls one of our rubrics. The Hauptstimme of m.36 begins with an [026] trichord, element (b) from the original Subordinate Theme block (B1, m.36). But its ic2-based continuation is 'blocked off' and placed in the bass register as Nebenstimme (m.57). The cycle then continues in the extreme upper register with a compressed statement of the cadential figure (d) from block B1—actually it is entirely reduced to its ic2 scalar framework, (B down to Eb). (The comparison is between element (d) as shown in Example 5.9 at m.38, middle staff, \(<B94725B3>, <B9x7\times5x3>\) and m.58 of the present example \(<B9753>\).)
Meanwhile, the middle staff displays a newly designed Hauptstimme, a skittering violin solo. Like its predecessor in block B1 (m.37) it is based on a tertial chaining—but the quality of thirds has been altered. It is this kind of apparently cavalier alteration that frustrates Berg analysts; one can admit the passage works, but the rationale for changes of detail seems determined, as Adorno would say, "to establish its insubstantiality." In this case, it is suggested that the chaining of 4–19 [0148] tetrachords which occurred in B1 (m.37) is here replaced by a chaining of 4–27 [0258] tetrachords. The former set-class, it will be recalled, is represented in the opening chord of the work, the latter in its partner, the second chord.

Locally, the change to 4–27 [0258] contributes to the gradual eradication from the texture of set-classes with semitonal content. Indeed, the momentary sense of freshness, the clearing of the air felt in mm.58–59 may be attributed to the presence of SCs 4–22 [0247] and 5–23 [02357], which recall explicitly the pitch-class content {3578A} and characteristic quartal/diatomic sonorities of the opening of the Präludium. This process culminates (via chained [015] trichords) in a complete statement of the aggregate as ic5 cycle in m.66 (C#7 to F#2). The process leading to this "unique sonic event" has been described in some detail by Bruce Archibald (1968, 84), who notes the centrality of pitches G4 and C5. The reader will recall from our discussion of the Main Theme that the possibility of a perfect-fourth space, G4–C5, would be realized in its extension as an ic5 aggregate chord at this m.66 climax. Beyond that possibility, however, the ic5 sonority is an anomaly in Reigen. It seems to lie 'outside the form', as was shown in formal diagram Figure 5.3 and harmonic blocks Example 5.8. The climactic chord, in alluding to the ic5-cycle aspect of the referential sonority of the Präludium, may perform an important cross-referencing function for the Opus 6 cycle as a whole, but
beyond its high C#, any internal meaning it might have for Reigen is likely to be programmatic.

This brings us to the close of our three analytical tacks on Reigen. Those seeking a more chronological presentation of the observations here organized under the rubrics blocks, chains, and cycles may—in conjunction with the score—review those more continuous Examples above in the following order: 5.3, 5.6, 5.10, 5.9, 5.12, 5.4, 5.5, and 5.11.

We move now to a Documentary Coda in two parts. The first part returns to the musical documents in order to consider an additional sketch and a bar-numbering anomaly. Both may have programmatic aspects, with connections to Berg's interest in the numerological theories of Wilhelm Fliess. The second and final part of the chapter reopens the Schnitzler connection and concludes with an overview of the form that merges blocks, chains, and cycles, Schnitzler scenes and Fliessnummern.
Documentary Coda, part 1: musical documents, and Wilhelm Fliess

There is one additional sketch for Reigen. It is found on the recto side of an extra sheet which Berg glued into the Nationalbibliothek sketchbook [A–Wn F 21 Berg 13/ii p. 47]. The verso side (p. 48) contains indefinite Marsch-like material and the musical content of the surrounding pages (46 and 49) form a musical continuity. (These Marsch sketches are examined in Chapter 7.) Example 5.13 provides a transcription of Berg 13/ii page 47.

The top of the page bears the doubly-underscored title "Walzer" although the theme which occurs beneath the title does not correspond to the score. Lower on the page, Berg has written "Fortsetzung" [continuation], and here the sketch begins to take the pitch-shape of alpha, which of course forms the basis of both mm. 20–24 and the animated [etwas belebend] thirds which follow. And just below this, the pitch content of the upper-voice of the beta motive of mm. 26ff is unmistakably present. The pitches are exact (G4–C#5–F#5–A5), although the rhythm is in hemiola augmentation and the following descent only gives the most general impression of the main tones. The profile of motive gamma is not yet present, although Berg has written "schwelgend" ["revelling"] above the A5, which at least encapsulates verbally the beta-ending 'yip', subsequently realized in mm. 27, 29, and 31 of the score. (Similarly, the word "jauchzend" ["jubilating"] is, probably, found on line 4.)

This is the only Reigen sketch found in A–Wn 13/ii, and the only sketch known for any of Reigen's Waltz material. The outside edge of the leaf has been roughly trimmed, the inside edge folded to assist its being glued in. The "N° _____" marking in the upper left corner of the sketch does not match those in the rest of the sketchbook. Rather, it is identical to those found in the unbound Stadtbibliothek sketchbook, from which document this page was likely transplanted.
Example 5.13: "Walzer" sketch. (Transcription of A-Wn F Berg 21 13/ii, p. 17; glued-in extra page of A-Wst type.)
The question is—why? There is no more room here to continue sketching. Berg decided to reserve the second half of this sketchbook for Wozzeck soon after he attended the play (05-05-1914). If the “Walzer” page were pasted in before that decision had been taken, it would surely have made more sense to put it somewhere in the second half of the book, or to leave it wherever it was (probably with the Stadtbibliothek materials) rather than to jam it into the Marsch sketches.

The sketch has limited musical value: though preserving the beta motive may have had some early compositional importance (since there are no other beta sketches extant) both it and the alpha idea are highly tentative. Indeed, the sketch’s best claim to posterity seems to be the “Walzer” heading. Berg was, in general, less conscious than Schoenberg of preparing for posterity, of organizing his creative legacy—except in so far as it was Schoenberg’s legacy! This was particularly true until the international success of Wozzeck obliged him to think differently. He may, after all, simply have found this page lying about much later, recognized its Opus 6 provenance and pasted into a known source for that work.

On the other hand, he seems to have gone to a lot of trouble, and we are perhaps faced with an artifact, an object deliberately placed in this location due to some personal resonance. And this is an important documentary location. The place in the sketchbook coincides with the interruption of his progress on Opus 6 due to the overwhelming urge to begin sketching ideas for an opera on Wozzeck. He was then obliged to present the Präludium and the Marsch to Schoenberg with the “Walzer” still in a very incomplete state. Subsequent delays in the completion of Reigen were due to the continuing complications of the war, to Berg’s self-doubts and his eventual physical and mental breakdown, the last in part caused by Schoenberg’s insufficiently positive reaction to Berg’s most recent work, including the two completed
pieces of Opus 6. The pasted-in artifact, then, seems emblematic of a turning point in Berg's personal and creative development. If this is true, it is tantalizing to note that the page forces its way into the sketchbook as the 23rd manuscript leaf.

Berg's fixation with the number 23 is well known. He found confirmation in Wilhelm Fliess's *Vom Leben und Tod* (Vienna, 1909) which associated male and female biocycles with the numbers 23 and 28 respectively. In a letter to Schoenberg from June, 1915—i.e., while preparing to go to Trahütten to complete *Reigen*—Berg says that he came upon Fliess's book "by chance" during the summer of 1914—i.e., while while finishing up the other two Opus 6 pieces. Robert Falck (1985) has argued that several major formal subdivisions in *Reigen* are spaced 23 measures apart and he applies this "Fliessnummer" in various ways to the formal subdivisions of Berg's piece. Falck's preferred schema is shown in Figure 5.5:

Figure 5.5: "Fliessnummer" 23 and the formal design of *Reigen* (Falck 1985).

- Walzer tempo m. 20 23
- Sehr ruhige . m. 42 23
- Höhepunkt m. "65" 23
- Etwas breiter m. "88" 23
- a tempo m. 111

These subdivisions certainly do correspond with major formal junctures in the piece, though other important moments are not embraced by the plan. Naturally, one must be careful asserting such relations, and structuralists (including Falck) are properly skeptical of observations which seem to have a fluidity of application not unlike the daily horoscope. The
measure numbers in quotations in Falck’s scheme stem from an erroneous count as it persisted through the 1923 edition, with its added measure number “45a” [for \(46=2\times23\)]. (Thus, Falck’s “m.65” is currently m.66 and “m.88” is now m.89; Falck utilizes the subdivision that occurs in m.110 to make the 23 count hit actual m.111.) The suggestion is implicit that the measure numbering discrepancy was a conscious error on Berg’s part, a jimmying of the count so that 23s abound. This is certainly a possibility given what we know of Berg’s later numerological proclivities.

On the other hand, examination of the Particell suggests that the numbering error could have arisen innocently enough: Berg marked every fifth measure of the Particell with an encircled number; measure 45 is the penultimate measure on folio 9v, measure 46 is somewhat wedged in at the lower right; it would appear that Berg simply forgot to count that measure when he continued with folio 10r, so that its encircled measure number 50 is actually measure 51.

We now relay the history of this numbering error subsequent to its appearance in the Particell. In the autograph score, page 11 contains mm. 42–45, the last with encircled number; page 12 continues with three measures (ostensibly 46–48) and page 13 with three more (ostensibly 49–51); the last measure of these measures, following the Particell, is also marked erroneously with an encircled 50. Page 12, however, shows a renumbering in pencil of the ostensible m. 46 as m. 45a. Since the fair copy of the score does not show such a correction; it would appear that Berg only later discovered the numbering error and went back to correct his autograph.

Indeed, the change is found in the page proofs for the 1923 edition where the first measure on page 12 is corrected in red pencil as m. 45a. The 1923 edition, itself based on the autograph fair copy, adds the stamped number 45a to the first measure of its page 29. The remaining measure numbers in
both page proofs and 1923 edition are not altered, probably because it would have been both awkward and costly to fix them all. It is only in the Fassung letzter Hand—the correction copy which prepares a second edition of the score beginning from a copy of the 1923 edition—that matters are put right: measure 45a on page 29 is crossed out in red ink; measure 50 on page 30 is similarly crossed out and a new encircled 50 is put in the correct position (one measure earlier); similar changes are made to the end of the piece.

Falck’s 23 counts start from measure 20, that is, after the introduction. Two other possibilities should be considered: (1) we might start the 23 count from the beginning; and (2) we might check for the other Fließnummer, the female 28, as well. For, though the latter number was of no direct personal significance to Berg, we might properly wonder if it does not appear, under Fließ’s immediate influence in Reigen, which is, after all, a series of male-female dialogues. Some of the possibilities are summarized in Figure 5.6.

Figure 5.6: Cycles of 23 and 28 after the numerology of Wilhelm Fließ.

Fliess’s 23s (the ‘male bio-cycle’):

1 23 46 69 92 115  (23 count from beginning)
20 23 23 23 23  

(Falck’s 23s; Falck [1985])

Fliess’s 28s (the ‘female bio-cycle’):

28 28 28 28

1 28 56 84 112  (28 count from beginning)
14 20 49 77 105  

(28s if taken from m.20)

In Figure 5.6, all measure numbers are those found in the present score. Those numbers in quotations appear ‘n-1’ in earlier documents due to the counting error discussed above. The first numbered measure in Reigen is actually a pickup, which suggests a certain arbitrariness, ±1, may be inherent.
If Berg's score is modeled on Schnitzler's play, it would be difficult to imagine a more appealing way for Berg to represent its interlocking chain of male and female characters than through the use of Fliess's male and female numerological bio-cycles. In his letter to Schoenberg (20-06-1915) Berg refers to his well-known fixation with 23, but he also emphasizes Fliess's conclusion: "that the woman's number is 28, that of the man 23." In Figure 5.6, the double-underlined measure numbers show strong correlation to structural events and tempo indications in the score; the single-underlined measure numbers are less convincing.

The whole enterprise is, of course, unabashedly speculative. Berg's own flexibility in the use of such creative crutches, his near gullibility in accepting Fliess's theories, suggest that a single overarching counting scheme may not be the point. The schemes shown in Figure 5.6 do, however, have a number of intriguing correspondences with moments in the score, as the following condensed run-through will attest:

m.14 (only half of 28?), beginning of transition, "etwas fliessender"; m.23-24(downbeat), begins second 23 cycle, alpha-motive thirds representing male 'élan vital', "etwas belebend"; m.28, the gamma-motive 'yip' "immer fliessender"; m.42, recapitulation of referential sonority, coincidence of 14-measure half-cycle and the 23rd measure after the beginning of the Waltz; m.46(2x23), "unmerklich belebend"; m.'49'(20+28), tail motive of the contrasting idea in the main theme (m.9) suddenly becomes a passionate tiger cadencing in m.55; m.56(2x28), episode based on the subordinate thematic idea—or, in keeping with that now politically-incorrect nineteenth-century aesthetic ideal—the 'feminine' theme; m.'66'(m.42+23) the climactic ic5 aggregate [in support of Falck's count, I note that Berg positioned his encircled measure number 65 directly over the climactic chord]; m.69(3x23) "derb bewegt," dramatic and brassy "schmetternd" reversal of fortune, emblematic of the upside-down world (referential sonority shifted), the downward side of the cyclical designs of both Reigens as was shown in Figure 5.1; m.'77' (m.20+2x28) "Fliessender" and its further liquidation (m.79) "Immer fliessend"; m.'84'(3x28), "Immer fliessend" and m.'89'(20+3x23) "etwas breiter, behäbiger; aber immer noch fliessend" form the two orchestral blocks based on subordinate
theme materials; m.'93'(i.e., [92], 4x23), tempo dissolves into recapitualtion of the Waltz and recovers alpha-motive thirds of m.24 at m.98; m.'105'(i.e., [104], 20+3x28), retransition, uses inverted form of delta motive over quasi-dominant pedal point; m.'111'(approx. [112]?, 20+4x23) signals the return of the initial delta motive as 'coda'; and m.115(5x23) final spiraling out of enlarged delta motive in bass with embedded inverted compressions from each note.

In brief, then, I would suggest that from Fliess, Berg adopted: the measure counting for sound blocks and for the cyclic recurrence of referential sonorities and themes; the association of 23 with male, and 28 with female characters in the subtextual realization of Schnitzler’s play; and the tempo marking puns on Fliess’s name (which means flow, or flowing) and on his idea of male \( \text{\`e\'lan vital} \) (as in “belebend,” enlivened or animated). These tempo-marking puns also correspond to measure counts of 23s and 28s.

From Schnitzler, I would suggest Berg adopted: the title; the formal concept of a series of short scenes (as sonorous blocks); the use of stage/cinematographic techniques (such as fade and dissolve) for joining them; the use of linkage to carry one idea (or character) forward into the next scene or section; and the idea of the coexistence of opposing characters on distinct ‘polyphonic planes’ (Schnitzler’s “dialogues,” with due ironic effect, are largely parallel monologues). In general, Berg eschews depiction of Schnitzler’s scenic details—in any case, the piece, at 5 1/2 minutes duration, is rather short for such antics. However, a few correspondences of ‘character’ and ‘sonority’ between the two Reigen will be apparent in my final soundbite summary.

**Figure 5.7** provides a synopsis of correspondences between Schnitzler’s Reigen and Berg’s Reigen, supplemented by Fliess’s numerology. The Figure merges the designs of block, chain, and cycle, the Schnitzler scenes and the Fliessnummern by presenting Reigen in a series of soundbites. A narrative summary of the Figure follows.
Figure 5.7:
Synopsis of correspondences between Schnitzler's *Reigen* and Berg's *Reigen*, supplemented by Fliess's numerology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scene</th>
<th>Schnitzler's <em>Reigen</em></th>
<th>Berg's <em>Reigen</em></th>
<th>Mm.</th>
<th>Fliessnummern</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1     | Evening near Augarten bridge.  
Prostitute (Leokadia) entices  
Soldier on way home. | MT 'intro' (A1)  
delta and MT proper;  
beta tattoo  
carries through (Tr) | 1 | 2/2 meter |
| 2     | Sunday evening on the Prater.  
Soldier (Franz) dances [polka]  
with the Chamber Maid (Marie). | Waltz (W)  
alpha-thirds  
beta-gamma 'yip' | 20 | 3/4 meter established  
etwas belebend  
immer fließender |
| 3     | Hot summer afternoon. His room.  
Chamber Maid seduced by  
Young Man (Alfred). | languid intro into ST,  
ic3/4 Nebenstimmung against  
wt-based Hauptstimme (B1) | 33 | |
| 4     | Evening. Banally elegant salon.  
(up a social level ...)  
Young Man's passionate tryst with  
Young Married Woman (Emma). | MT returns (A2) at first  
quite subdued, then  
tail motive becomes  
tiger—schwungvoll, fast roh | 42 | 20+23 & 3x14  
2x23 unmerklich belebend  
20+28 |
| 5     | Cosy bedroom. 10:30 p.m.  
Young Woman receives discourse  
on 'purity' of marital love from  
Husband (Karl); irony. | ST wt idea recurs (B2):  
violin ic3/4 skitters off;  
ponderous texture culminates  
in ic5 (‘pure 4ths’) aggregate | 56 | 2x28 |
| 6     | Chambre séparée in Riedhof.  
Husband dines with the  
Sweet Young Thing muffling her  
calls a waiter might interrupt. | MidT (C) contrasting middle  
idea is horizontalization T1 of  
m.6 referential sonority (A3);  
Waltz sequence fades to | 69 | 3x23 derb bewegt  
20+2x28  
(G.P.) 'no waiter' |
| 7     | Poet's garret.  
Sweet Young Thing's qualities as  
intellectual ingenue are too much  
for Poet (Robert) to resist. | ST (B3) orchestral block:  
compresses ST material in  
polyphonic planes; quality  
of film-like flicker, 'cut' | 83 | 3x28 immer fließender |
| 8     | Moonlit room in a country inn.  
Poet (Robert) meets his romantic  
and theatrical match in Actress | the same block restructured  
through transposition and  
expanded sonority: ‘dissolves’  
into recapitulation of | 89 | 20+3x23  
immer noch fließend |
| 9     | In her canopy bed at noon  
the Actress persuades visiting  
Count to unbuckle his sword. | Waltz (W) theme, perhaps  
signaling aristocrat's entry:  
leads to Retransition, marked  
by inversion of delta, quasi-V | 92/94 | 4x23  
105 | 20+3x28 |
| 10    | 6 a.m., poorly furnished room.  
The amnesic Count awakens  
with the Prostitute. On his way  
out, he wishes a chamber maid  
good morning, as dawn breaks. | Return of delta (A4) as coda;  
the delta motive spirals out  
in bass register, final 11-note  
chord to RH; hanging beta  
breaks for hns & trpts | 111 | 20+4x23: 4x28  
115 | 5x23 |
Documentary Coda, part 2: Berg and Schnitzler

NARRATIVE SUMMARY FOR FIGURE 5.7

Scene 1. Evening in Vienna near the Augarten bridge. (cf. Ex.5.6)

A Prostitute (Leokadia) entices a Soldier on his way home to the barracks. The atmosphere of section A1 is set by the delta motive (m.1, m.4), the dialogue by the main theme proper (oboe and bassoon, imitation in horns, m.6ff). The soldier's tattoo-like beta figure becomes the basis of the Transition (m.14) which carries us through to the next scene.

Scene 2. Sunday evening on the Prater. (cf. Ex.5.10)

The Soldier (Franz) dances with the Chamber Maid (Marie). Schnitzler's gloss calls for a polka; Berg saves his polka for Wozzeck and stays with his originally planned Waltz (W). At m.24 the Soldier's alpha-thirds become somewhat animated, and the dancing continues with the beta-gamma figure's characteristic whole-tone-based 'yip', immer fließender at m.28. The Waltz liquidates with a languid repeated figure (m.33) that doubles as the introduction to ...

Scene 3. Young Man's room. (cf. Ex.5.9)

It is a hot summer afternoon. The Young Man (Alfred)'s parents are away. The Chamber Maid (Marie) is summoned to his room and is (not so unwillingly) seduced. Their dialogue (Subordinate Theme B1, mm.36–41) is represented by the combination of the yearning whole-tone-based figure (he, m.36ff) and the quietly skittering chain of arpeggiated violin thirds (she, m.37, nicht eilen); he succeeds in holding her back (m.39ff, zurücktretend).
Scene 4. Evening. Banally elegant salon. (cf. Ex.5.6, like opening)

The atmospheric A2 section returns the original referential sonority (m.42) in conjunction with a somewhat fragmented main theme (m.43). We are up a social level in a banally elegant salon. The Young Man has an evening tryst with the Young Woman (Emma). The section begins quite subdued, but at m.46 (2x23) becomes "unnoticeably animated" (unmerklich belebend); then, from m.49 "full of verve, almost raw" (Schwungvoll, fast roh) as the continuation tail of the main theme suddenly becomes a tiger and, after a two-measure parenthetic interpolation (mm.52-53, plötzlich ruhiger), and cadential idea is pushed to passionate conclusion (m.54-55).

Scene 5. Cosy bedroom. 10:30 p.m. (cf. Ex.5.12)

Section B2 (m.56–68). To the revised chain of arpeggiated violin thirds (m.57), the Young Woman skitters off home to her cosy bedroom and Husband (Karl)—you can hear him on trombone (m.57). The Husband discourses philosophically on the sweet "purity" of marital love, spinning his wholetones into "pure" fourths. This culminates in the ic5 aggregate climax of m.66, "a cool, clear, mysterious, and entirely new sonority" (Archibald 1968, 86). The moment, has considerable dramatic irony since we know Karl has been cuckolded in the previous scene.

Irony, however, quickly leads to hypocrisy. At this turning point in Schnitzler's drama, the central disillusion of bourgeois marriage is revealed. If, as Falck has suggested, Berg, in 1914–15, might more easily have identified with the Husband than with the Young Man, his music, from mm.66 to 72, sits between Scenes 5 and 6 in decidedly harried contemplation of this dramatic juncture. The rapid dissolution of the climax destroys the fourths of the ic5 aggregate with a descending wholetone pentachord 5–33 <1B975>, a [016] trichord <182>, and then, in the guise of the contrasting Middle Theme
(m.69, 3x23, *derb bewegt*) recovers the lower pentachord of the original referential sonority 5–17 [01348] at T1 <36A25>, in a manner “wild and fragmentary—as if the shock of this event had torn the music apart (Archibald 1968, 86).” Berg’s music embodies the impact of a Lulu on the male libido, not that of Schnitzler’s *Sweet Young Thing*. The theme at m.69 possesses an almost demonic character, as if to mark the downturn in the formal cycle, the failure of social hierarchy to contain Eros. But this contrasting middle section soon regains its equilibrium, and the lighter touch more in keeping with Schnitzler’s next scene.

Scene 6. Chambre séparée of the Hotel Riedhof. (cf. Ex.5.4) The husband seduces the *Sweet Young Thing*, whom he prefers to pretend a sexual ingenue. As the returning Waltz sequence (m.73ff) fragments and fades, the Husband muffles the *Sweet Young Thing’s* concerns that a waiter might interrupt. General Pause, m.82: no waiter comes.

We now come to the two orchestral blocks (together, section B3, mm.83–88 and m.89ff) which would correspond to the two scenes involving the Poet.

Scene 7. Poet’s garret. (cf. Ex.5.5, block 1) In his garret, the Poet (Robert) is taken with the *Sweet Young Thing’s* qualities as intellectual ingenue. Block 1 displays a quality of cinematographic flicker, its flow (*immer fliessender*) terminated by a final “cut” to the beta motive. (This section parallels B1, m.36ff, the scene between the Young Man and the Chamber Maid.) And ...
Scene 8. Moonlit room in a country inn. (cf. Ex.5.5, block 2)

In a moonlit room in a country inn, the Poet and the Actress have a romantic and theatrically expansive encounter. Block 2 expands block 1 through choices of transpositional levels, registral placements, and orchestrational resources. This block “dissolves” into ...

Scene 9, where the return of the Waltz theme (m.92/94, and m.98) marks the entry of the aristocratic Count.

Scene 9. Actress’s bedroom at noon. (cf. Ex.5.11, for lead-in to Retransition)

In her canopy bed at noon, the late-rising Actress persuades the visiting Count to unbuckle his sword. The dissipation of the Waltz (m.98ff) leads to the Retransition (m.105ff), marked by the inversion of theme delta over a quasi dominant pedal.

Scene 10. 6 a.m., Prostitute’s room. (like opening, cf. Ex.5.8 for last chord)

The Coda (A4) begins with the return of delta (m.111). It is 6 a.m. in the Prostitute’s poorly furnished room. The amnesiac Count awakens. As he prepares to leave, the enlarged delta motive spirals out in the bass register with compressed inversional eddies emanating from each of its notes (m.115ff=5x23). The final eleven-note chord is reiterated to the Hauptrhythmus of the Opus 6 cycle while the Count bids the maid good morning at the door; as he steps out, dawn—in the form of hanging motive beta—breaks.
CONCLUSION:

We began this chapter with a reference to the continuing resistance of Berg's music to singular methodological assault. Even in Reigen, ostensibly the most transparent of the Opus 6 pieces, a multivalent approach has been preferable. Adorno alludes to this evanescent quality—particularly appropriate in the case of Reigen—in the following insightfully poetic manner:

Under an analytic gaze this music completely dissolves, as if it contained no solid components. It vanishes even while still in its apparently fixed, objectified state. Had one drawn Berg's attention to this he would, in his own bashful way, have been as pleased as someone caught in a secret kindness. (Adorno, 1991, p.2.)

In disclosing the programmatic aspects of his work, we have perhaps caught Berg in a secret kindness to himself. The Fliessnummern and, more substantially, the Schnitzler play provide a complex analog to the musical subtleties of Berg's work. Analytically, the rubrics block, chain, and cycle have provided us with temporary triangulating fixes on this ephemeral piece: orchestral blocks, and planing block progressions, formal blocks, and harmonic referential blocks; chains through linkage, un-linkage, and structural framing of thematic ideas; cyclic motives, interval-cycle segments, and cyclic form. Though, as Adorno says, any one component rigorously pursued tends to vanish, even as we hold it before us.

Ultimately, however, Reigen, as we stated at the outset, is about form. Even before we fold in the programmatic considerations, the piece constitutes a remarkable achievement in formal design. This is true at the level within thematic constructions (the main and subordinate theme groups, and the waltz sections) as well as in their transformed recurrences. Berg's use of the
various compositional procedures that we have linked together as 'blocks, chains, and cycles' in this chapter, his use of Fliess's numerological controls, and his realization of the thematic 'character' and structure of Schnitzler's play: all of these are in the service of formal design.

As Stravinsky rather boldly put it (1959, 71-72):

[Berg] is the only one to have achieved large-scale development-type forms without a suggestion of 'neo-classic' dissimulation ... the essence of his work is thematic structure, and the thematic structure is responsible for the immediacy of the form. However complex, however 'mathematical' the latter are, they are always 'free' thematic forms born of 'pure feeling' and 'expression'.
Notes to Chapter 5, Reigen:

1Falck presented the Reigen case in “Berg and Schnitzler: Hand in Hand?,” a 1985 conference paper. The paper was subsequently revised and was to be published in the International Alban Berg Society Newsletter. Unfortunately, due to the extended dormancy of that journal, Falck’s revised paper has yet to appear. I was privilege to some elaborations of Falck’s views through his capacity as supervisor of this dissertation. Subsequent notes acknowledge more specific indebtedness to his work, and point out where our studies diverge. The circular formal designs of Figure 5.1 are derived from Falck.

1Bruce Archibald’s deservedly well-known article, “The Harmony of Berg’s ‘Reigen’” (1968), was, long ago, my own point of departure: Archibald’s work is extended at several points in the present study.

1It was interesting to see the solution taken by choreographer Glen Tetley to this absence of ensemble in Schnitzler’s design. Near the end of Tetley’s ballet, La Ronde (National Ballet of Canada production, Toronto, 06-11-87), a carousel-like, grand-chain reprise of characters follows the series of pas-de-deux. The music used was Korngold’s Sinfonietta, op. 5.

1Carl E. Schorske develops the broader context of this conflict between the aristocratic, Catholic, and aesthetic versus bourgeois, legalist, and rationalist character of fin-de-siècle Austrian culture. See Schorske 1982, p. xxviii and chapter 1, in particular.

1Schnitzler, Reigen, scene iv. The Young Man is surprised she is not wearing a corset. She replies that she never wears one, and justifies this by saying the famous actress Odilon does not wear one either. “Ich trag nie ein Mieder. Die Odilon trägt auch keines.” The allusion to Odilon is omitted from the English translation.

1Falck 1985. Falck develops a somewhat different cross-circle pairing. Whereas his characters are paired by (in the geometric sense) “chords” across the hypothetical circle, mine are paired by “diameters” across the circle. The exceptional “chord” struck by my Soldier-Count pairing acknowledges both their extreme positions in social-hierarchic institutional terms and their proximate formal positions to the circle-closing Prostitute. Falck’s pairings establish a bilateral symmetry which might imply a type of palindromic structure; mine will suggest a more reiterative or variational structure, in fact, a modified rondo.
I am indebted to Falck for these descriptive epithets concerning the tempo manipulations.

On *Ver sacrum*, see Nebehay 1977. Relevant works include Maximilian Lenz’s “Frühlingstreiben” which shows naked girls dancing with linked hands around a flowering tree, and—perhaps more *Lulu*-like—Alfred Roller’s illustration for Arno Holz’s poem “Die Circassierin.” The use of dance, and of round dance in particular, as symbol of life in fin-de-siècle art is the subject of an unpublished paper by Walter Salmen, “Reigen und Tanz als Lebenssymbole in den Künsten um 1900.” (1989a, direct communication with the author; see also Salmen 1989b in the *Musikgeschichte in Bildern* series).


Schnitzler, as a physician in the late 1880s, had experimented with clinical hypnosis and had published a paper on aphasis which influenced Freud’s subsequent work on aphasia. Freud had cordial relations with both Schnitzler and the Berg family. He was a frequent guest at the Berghof and was actually the consulting physician in Berg’s first fateful asthmatic attack (23–07–1908). See E.A. Berg 1985, 74–75; also E.A. Berg 1976, 20.

Semler 1968. It was Miss Frida who felt compelled to inform Donald Harris that the racy Wedekind and Schnitzler plays were—as noted on my Figure 5.1—*not* read aloud! (Harris 1980, 200).

The playbill and seating plan are reproduced in E.A. Berg 1976, 94 and 96.

On Schnitzler (and Hermann Bahr) as Kraus targets, see: “Wie macht man das? [How does one do that?],” *Die Fackel* 399 (18–05–1914): 12; Kraus seizes on a report that the Männergesangverein will be “repeating” its thousandth concert, and with reference to the Thousand and One Nights, shudders at the prospect that the fifty-first birthdays of Bahr and Schnitzler might give rise to a repeat celebration of their fiftieth!

Kraus satirizes Schnitzler’s desired social presence in: “Wien und Wedekind,” *Die Fackel* 370/371 (05–03–13): 22 (with a parody of Reigen): “(Die Gattin:) ’In unserer Reihe war der Schnitzler.’ ‘Schnitzler war da? Schnitzler hab ich nicht gesehn.’” [“(The Wife:) ‘Schnitzler was in our row. ‘Schnitzler was there? I didn’t see Schnitzler.’”]

Schnitzler 1981: diary entries for 14–10–10 and 19–10–11. The entry for the first date also reports that Oscar Straus declined a third-party suggestion to set a few Reigen scenes melodramatically! Elsewhere, Schnitzler reports on dinner conversations with Schoenberg-circle violinist Arnold Rose (24–04–12): “Angeregte Unterhaltung über musikalische Fragen; Schönberg, allerlei Schwindel. – Schreker wird höchst lobend erwähnt.”


Schnitzler 1985, Tagebuch entry for 06–06–19. The diary entry records Schnitzler’s attendance at the Verein performance which included the two-piano eight-hand arrangement of Reigen. The concert is noted, and the diary entry quoted, in Chapter 6, p.289.


References to the latest issues of Die Fackel occur often in Berg’s correspondence. According to Erich Berg, brother Charly brought the periodical into the Berg household from its inception (April 1899). See E.A. Berg 1985, 17.

“Antworten des Herausgebers,” Die Fackel 148 (02–12–1903): 23–24. The opinion expressed is actually that of Dr. Robert Hirschfeld, Viennese correspondent of the Frankfurter Zeitung (22–11–1903). Kraus assails a favourite target, Hermann Bahr, whose plans for a public reading of Reigen are called an attempt to sponge off the Reigen publicity [“Bahr’s Versuch, an der ‘Reigen’-Reklame zu schmarotzen”]. “Ich halte den ‘Reigen’ für ein Kunstwerk; er ist gerade so Kunstwerk wie die Kleinkunst im geheimen Kabinett zu Neapels, aber auch gerade wie diese nur eine Abteilung der Kunst, die sich nich jedermann, nicht jeder Frau öffnet. ... er wird versiegelt in Haus geschickt wie die Literatur des geheimen Männerschubfaches.”
Wenn auf solch amourose Art die Zeit vertrieben ist, folgt nichts nach, und Herzklopfen ist nur eine physiologische Störung.


Notizhefte references include: A–Wn F 21 Berg 474/28, 2v; and 474/51, 5: “Albine in Wien”—this last from Summer 1916. Berg’s Vienna addresses were: in 1885, I. Tuchlauben 8; 1899, VII. Breitegasse 8; 1905, Hietzinger Hauptstrasse 6; Fall 1907, Vordere Vollamstrasse 11; August 1910, Nußdorferstrasse 19; and Fall 1911, XII. Trauttmsdorfgasse 27. Folios 68v and 69 of notebook A–Wn F 21 Berg 479/57 contain a detailed floor plan drawing of the last address, followed by diagrams and decorating plans for the newlyweds’ new residence. (A similar floorplan is found on the endpaper, fol.1, of the opus 6 sketchbook, Berg 13/ii.) The title Reigen recurs on folio 67 of the notebook. Altenberg’s name is there as well: Berg apparently circulated Altenberg’s works widely, judging from the numerous entries.

Berg’s copy of the 1903 edition of Reigen mostly indicates passages from the Husband’s speeches in the dialogue with his Wife (Scene 5). (Falck, though unaware of this source, has suggested that Berg may have identified best with the Husband in 1913–1915.) Two of the highlighted passages are heavily ironic: the Husband warns the Wife not to associate with women whose reputation is in doubt (she has, of course, cuckolded him in the previous scene); the Husband assures his Wife that, despite his own premarital encounters, he has loved only her, that “One can only love where there is purity and truth.” [“Man liebt nur, wo Reinheit und Wahrheit ist.”] Three earlier speeches are also highlighted: the first concerns the value of platonic periods in marriage (the Wife quickly perceives that the current ”Freundschaftsperiode” is about to end!); the other two passages, punctuated by the Wife’s unsuppressible laughing “Oh!,” pontificate on the “mysteriousness” of marriage. Whether or not Berg shared Schnitzler’s
incisively ironic view of the 'mysterious purity of marriage', I suspect he could have done no better than to represent it the climactic aggregate chord of 'pure fourths' [Reine Quarten] at m.66.

Publication information on Schnitzler's Reigen from Allen 1966, 54; Berlin and Vienna: Benjamin Harz, 1914. I originally speculated that Berg might have purchased and annotated a copy of this new edition sometime in 1914 even though it is largely a resetting of the 1903 edition which he already owned and frequently loaned. If this were the case, however, such a copy has not been discovered.

Archibald 1966, 75n3 discusses this Ab: “Noteworthy is the necessity of the Ab in the penultimate chord as a textural balance, as a contrast to the inward wedge, as a motivic participant, and as a further emphasis on the minor third.” Our survey of the preceding documentary evidence makes us flinch at the invocation of "necessity" but Archibald’s account is otherwise apt.

This thematic overlapping of subordinate ideas was first noted by Archibald; see his description of the passage, 1968, 87–88.

The normal form of motive beta begins and ends with a major third; the minor third variants are used transitionally or to adjust to the prevailing harmonic situation: compare, for example, the alternative versions of beta in the harp, mm.9–12, “corrected” to the major third norm (in violin, oboe, and imitatively de-synchronized horn combination) when the real (capital-T) Transition section begins at m.14.)

See Archibald’s fine discussion of this Transition, as “the second part of the introduction,” 1968, 87–90. The underlying transpositional scheme of this Transition leads to the ‘un-linkage’ of motive beta in the Waltz harmonies of m.20ff; this is shown in my Example 5.10, p.257.
6 "Interlude": performance and publication
to history of Opus 6

This chapter documents the history of Opus 6 from the time of
Reigen's completion in dedication fair copy (August, 1915; ends of Chapters 2
and 3, above) through its initial performances and the process of its
publication. Along the way, we also touch upon the changed nature of the
relationship between Schoenberg and Berg. Additional topics include aspects
of instrumentation and performance practice, and the posthumous
publication and performance revival of Opus 6.

The principal musical documents are: Berg's autograph score (US-
NYpm) and the fair copy of the score which was orginally presented to
Schoenberg (US-NYpm)—both described in Chapter 3, above; Berg's two-
piano eight-hand arrangement of the pieces (private collection, exact
whereabouts unknown) and related items; the edited page proofs for the 1923
edition (A-Wn F 21 Berg 142); the 1923 edition (60 copies; I examined one at
the Newberry Library in Chicago); Berg's 1929 revised score (A-Wn F 21 Berg
141; the 'Fassung letzter Hand'), and the various posthumous editorial
documents related to the production of the 1954 edition and the study scores.

Additional documentary sources include: Berg's correspondence with
Schoenberg, Webern, and Helene Berg; communications between Berg and
performers, student-copyists, and Universal Edition; Universal Edition's
'Verlagskartei' (publisher's card catalogue which records dates of performances and publication) and memoranda in the UE Archive (A-Wst); and Berg's binder file of programs and press clippings (A-Wn I' 21 Berg 3135), organized by opus, which was continued by Helene Berg after the composer's death.

After Berg completed the fair copy of Reigen and sent it to Schoenberg in August of 1915, he began the military duties which culminated in his physical breakdown at the end of November. He was then assigned guard duty in Vienna, and, from January 1916 until the end of the war, was given a clerical post in the War Ministry. Berg continued to circulate his works, including Opus 6, amongst his friends during this period, and devoted summer and sick leaves to further work on Wozzeck. Following the war, the Schoenberg circle formed the Verein für musikalische Privataufführungen [Society for Private Musical Performances]. It was in this venue that part of Opus 6 received its premiere performance.

**Opus 6 and the Verein**

The impetus for the formation of the Verein was a series of open rehearsals of Schoenberg's Chamber Symphony given in June of 1918. These had been prompted by the pedagogical popularity (though not financial fortune) of Schoenberg's composition seminar at the Schwarzwald school. Berg's official position in the Verein was that of Vortragsmeister [rehearsal director], along with Steuermann and Webern. This position involved coaching the early rehearsals of a program; the final rehearsals took place before Schoenberg. However, because Steuermann and Webern (and Schoenberg as well) were more experienced performers, Berg effectively became chief executive officer of the Society—Schoenberg was, of course,
President. Indeed, the Prospectus (September, 1918) for the formation (23–11–18) of the Verein was largely Berg's work.4

Schoenberg and Berg were both in the Vienna area from May 1916 (though Schoenberg moved to the M"odling suburb in April of 1918) and this allowed closer personal contact. Berg attended the Schwarzwald Seminars and the Chamber Symphony rehearsals, and the Schoenbergs held regular Sunday teas. (The teas were aided materially by gifts of food from the seminar participants and by substantial gifts of money which Schoenberg received following the open rehearsals). On 23–06–18, after tea, Schoenberg, Berg, Webern, and Steuermann played Schoenberg's Op. 16 Orchestra Pieces on two pianos; Berg stayed on alone for supper; and, over two bottles of wine, Schoenberg proposed that they use the informal "Du" (a privilege which had been extended to Webern since 1912).5

Webern reported that Berg's Orchesterst"ucke had been taken up for performance by the Verein (08–03–19 W–B). The concert took place 06–06–19 in the Kleiner Konzerthaus-Saal (the Schubert-Saal), the twenty-fourth concert of the Verein and the fourth concert open to the general public ("IV. Propaganda-Abend"). Only Reigen was performed, in an arrangement for two pianos, eight hands. The pianists were Eduard Steuermann, Olga Novakovic, Cesia Dische and Ernst Bachrich. The other items on the program were: Bartók, 14 Bagatelles, op. 6; Stravinsky, 4 Berceuses du chat and Pribaoutki; and Webern, 5 Lieder, op. 3, and Passacaglia, op. 1, arranged for two pianos, six hands.6

Naturally, Berg was expected to serve as Vortragsmeister for Reigen, but he fell quite ill at the end of May and had to leave the city to recuperate at the Berghof. He wrote to Schoenberg (01–06–19): "How much would I have liked to hear the Stravinsky Songs and Webern's things again and my Reigen, which I was obliged to leave behind in a wholly unfinished state of
rehearsal.” Webern took over the final rehearsals, as we see from Berg’s letter of 02–06–19:7

My dear friend, I didn’t as much as say Adieu: our departure really came so fast, and you were—then occupied with rehearsals and the like—almost unreachable. Today I must thank you for having taken on my Reigen. I am, therefore, more at ease than if I had rehearsed it myself. How beautiful the next evenings in Vienna ought to be now.

We will give Webern’s report on the ‘beautiful evenings’ in a moment.

But first, in view of our previous chapter, we should acknowledge the report of a prominent member of the public. Here is Arthur Schnitzler’s diary entry (06–06–19):8

With Olga. Opera School (Miss Oppelt Magic Flute) — and then Concert under the direction of Schoenberg — in part interesting (Stravinsky, one thing by Bartok); others talentless, foolish (Alban Berg, Webern); the public [was] radical, Bolshevistic, hate-filled and unwashed. Shows of applause and displeasure forbidden. [The composer, Wilhelm] Grosz, who was with us, is already ranked as reactionary by these people.

Schnitzler apparently took no special notice of Berg’s Reigen title—which one might take as negative evidence for our programmatic allegations in Chapter 5, though I prefer to think of it as a moment of delicious dramatic irony.

Webern’s report (09–06–19) follows:9

I must first of all tell you that your “Reigen” pleased me extraordinarily well. A splendid piece. Schoenberg too had such an impression. The performance went well. I still had five productive rehearsals. The piece sounded grand. Perhaps it might have been a little more flowing [fließender(!)]. How much would I have wanted to know whether it was played to your satisfaction. But I hope, that there will be another opportunity this year to establish that. Arnold Schoenberg was also satisfied. Steuermann again played your Sonata very beautifully [at the preceding concert, 30–05–19]. The evenings had resounding success. The last was over-attended. Many had to be sent away. There were no
more places in the hall. Completely sold out. The Stravinsky was
glorious. Wonderful these Songs.

Berg replied (18–06–19): 10

I am happy, that my piece pleased you and that you—as I also have
heard from other sources—brought it off so beautifully. I thank you so
much for the love and toil that you expended on it. That I was unable
to hear it!! And the Stravinsky also?

By way of musical documents, the Berg Nachlaß contains only a
remnant from this Verein performance of Opus 6. A-Wn F 21 Berg 69
contains cover wrappers and fragmentary drafts of the two-piano reduction.
Folio 4v is ostensibly the front sheet of what was once a double sheet which
served as a wrapper for the full score: "Drei Orchesterstücke / Op. 6 /
(Partiturauszug)". Folios 7–8 form a double sheet (oblong, 20-line format)
which served as a wrapper for the arrangement; folio 8v reads (in red pencil):
"Orchesterstücke / 8 händiger / Auszug / (Reinschrift)". This would indicate
that all three pieces were arranged. The designation "Reinschrift" [fair copy]
suggests the existence of a "Niederschrift" [rough copy]—there, of course,
must have been at least two copies for the two-piano performance of Reigen.

Folio 7r contains a rough two-piano eight-hand sketch of the Marsch,
from measure 143 to the beginning of measure 149 (i.e., the "weird chords"
and the recapitulation of the 'big tune' [DeVoto's theme XXI] from m. 66).
The parts are marked piano primo, right and left, and piano secondo, right
and left, respectively (I. R[echts] and L[inks]; II. R[echts] and L[inks]). (Folio 8r,
the inside of the cover, contains a very light sketch—really more a doodle—
which superficially resembles the Reigen delta theme. Folio 7v is blank.)

A different type of sheet, folio 6 (upright format, 12-line), contains a
rough copy of a fragmentary piano arrangement of Reigen, mm. 1–7 (6v) and
mm. 8–12 (6r). This much of the arrangement is playable on a single piano,
four-hands, but begins to get into trouble with the harp arpeggiation by measure 12. It is unlikely that this one-folio segment represents the final appearance of Berg's arrangement.

What happened to the complete eight-hand arrangement? I believe that at least one copy is now in a private collection in Switzerland, but I have—most unfortunately for this study—not been able to obtain precise information concerning its whereabouts. What might such a document look like? We may expect the document, if complete, to be in three fascicles, perhaps bound. The three movements would require approximately eight-, sixteen- and thirty-two-page gatherings, respectively. The writing is probably in pencil, perhaps with various analytical markings for (and by) the performers to indicate motives and their derivations (e.g., through inversion or retrograde). There will be alterations of dynamics and verbal annotations which were made during rehearsal. The performing copy will show disposition indicators (like the "R" and "L" codes of Berg 69 folio 7r) and passages of the arrangement will likely be boxed in red, others in blue (or green), to clarify the assignment of the players' parts and to mark motives.

These colour codings are also found in Berg's Particell at the beginning of the Marsch (A-Wn F 21 Berg 12, folio 18; a grayscale facsimile of the page is provided in Chapter 7, p.373): blue "R" and "L" are assigned to "Spieler des 1. Klaviers", red "R" and "L" to "Spieler des 2. Klaviers". In the Particell, the assignment of these letters to musical passages is inconsistent and is completely abandoned after the first six pages (i.e., by measure 39, approximately). The arrangement of Reigen should also show the error in measure numbering that was carried forward from Particell and autograph score and which was not corrected until the 1923 edition.
Performance Possibilities

Following the Verein performance of Reigen, several possibilities for an orchestral performance of Opus 6 were entertained. This required the production of parts, a task which fell initially to Berg’s student, Gottfried Kassowitz. The first possibility is discussed in the same post-performance letter to Webern (18–06–19). Berg tells Webern that a group in Dresden, through pianist and composer Erwin Schulhoff, plans to perform his op. 1 Sonata and op. 2 Lieder, and they also want to do the Three Orchestra Pieces: I shall send them the score and parts. At the moment I have no parts. Kassowitz began to produce some some time ago (that was before my departure for the Berghof) and I told him at the time that he should ask you for the score when the performance of Reigen was over, since it’s the only copy I have [i.e., the autograph copy, or perhaps just its Reigen fascicle; Schoenberg would still have had the fair copy]. Did he do that? Please be so kind to write him a card and tell him where and when he can pick up the score of Reigen. [Berg gives Kassowitz’s address.] Don’t be annoyed, that I pester you so; but I don’t want to let the thing go, since I don’t just now have the score in my hands. Perhaps nothing will come of the performance in Dresden. But it is just as well the parts are written out. When one needs something in a hurry, one usually can’t get it.

Webern replied (23–06–19): “I already gave Kallowitz [sic] the score of ‘Reigen’ last Friday. I too believe that these people in Dresden are ‘chatterers’ ['Schwätzer']” Throughout the summer, Berg continued to exchange with Webern and Schoenberg concerning Schulhoff, Schulhoff’s publisher (H. C. Jatho of Berlin, to whom Schulhoff had recommended Berg and Webern), and the ever-less-likely Dresden performance. Berg was well aware of the difficulty of his score and began to wonder if it would ever be performed. Nonetheless, he continued to work on the production of parts, even interrupting his work on Wozzeck for the task, as he says to Schoenberg (19–08–19):
News. Only that I had to interrupt my composing almost 3 weeks ago, since I have to write out the parts to one of the 3 Orchestra Pieces myself. Kassowitz can't be finished with them on time by himself. Meanwhile I hear nothing more at all from Dresden. In the end the whole work (which is very large—3-400 pages of parts) may have been for nothing.

In September, Berg tells Helene that Universal Edition has agreed to handle the distribution of Opus 6 and its parts, which he continued to go through that month. However, the parts were still incomplete the following summer, as the following letter from Berg to Kassowitz indicates (24-07-20).

You take Reigen, I'll take the Marsch. Now you won't be able to overlook [the job] so easily, and will take it up through your optimism, so well known and already so sympathetic to me, that you'll soon be at the end of it. How I'd like to share this optimism, but the thought that I must now for the remaining 4 to 5 weeks, when I am in the middle of composing and am getting along, even had hoped, to finish the 2nd Act—that I must interrupt all that in order to write out parts—which thought is hideous!!! So I can well imagine that you're now tearing your hair out. You must not abandon me now, dear friend. For you know what rides on it. Therefore, dear Kassowitz, let me know at your earliest convenience, how things stand with you concerning the whole affair, so that I can get myself set up for it.

Nothing came of the Dresden proposal for Opus 6. Similarly, nothing came of a proposed performance by "the so-called Sak-Philharmonic (the 2nd Czech orchestra)" which wished to do Berg's pieces in December 1920. Hermann Scherchen, who eventually did perform Opus 6 in 1931 (see below), was interested in them as early as 1921 and hoped to perform them in Berlin in 1922-23. Berg, in an unpublished portion of a letter to Helene Berg (24-05-22), also alludes to a request he made of Steuermann to bring back the parts from Prague where they had been deposited with Schulhoff—presumably for another performance which did not take place. These parts would have been the ones copied by Berg and Gottfried Kassowitz. (By this
time, Berg was using students Fritz Heinrich Klein and Fritz Mahler as copyists/professionals for the piano-vocal score of Wozzeck, though Kassowitz remained a pupil and also assisted in some of the later sessions for Wozzeck parts. Berg states his relief that the parts are available for Scherchen in a letter to Schoenberg (17–07–22). 20

Curious evidence for an additional performance possibility for Opus 6 during this period is found in A-Wn F 21 Berg 74/xiv. This is a bundle of papers of varying formats; most of its contents concern the Chamber Concerto. Folios 11 and 12 of this bundle form a bifolio. The top half of folio 12 (i.e., the upper right quadrant of the double sheet) is missing. The top half of folio 11 has been folded back and down. The lower half of folio 11 bears a draft (written perpendicularly across the staves) of Berg’s “open letter” (finished version dated 09–02–25) to Schoenberg concerning the design of the Chamber Concerto. The top half of folio 11 (15-stave, oblong format, used upside down) bears the title “Marsch” and, to the right, “Alban Berg Op 6 No. 3”. Below these, the page has been set up for the following ensemble: “Gr Fl (auch Picc), Ob (auch EH), Kl in A (auch BöKl in B), Horn in F, Harmonium, Klavier, 1. Gg, 2. Gg, 3. Gg (auch 2. Br.), 1. Bratsche, Vcl, KBö.” Only the first measure of the cello part contains music: the opening motive of the Marsch, though minus its bowing articulations and marked “molto p.”

Clearly this is an abandoned Verein-ensemble arrangement of the Marsch. The Verein, in its first season, performed numerous works for larger ensembles in two- to eight-hand piano reductions—the performance of Reigen among them. In the subsequent seasons, more arrangements for this type of chamber ensemble were performed. 21 For example, Webern’s arrangement of his Opus 10 Orchestra Pieces was first performed 30–01–20, his arrangement of his Opus 6 Orchestra Pieces was first performed 23–01–21, and Schoenberg’s arrangement (with Felix Greissle) of his Opus 16 Orchestra
Pieces was performed in an open rehearsal 25–02–20 and, subsequently, in the third Prague concert of the Verein 13–03–20. Berg makes brief mention of his unfinished arrangement in a letter to Schoenberg (24–12–22) more than a year after the final Verein concert had taken place:22

You can well imagine, my dearest friend, that the rapid, almost harried completion of the Wozzeck piano score has absorbed all of my time these past two to three weeks. This, as well as my intention to surprise you [Berg gave Schoenberg a copy of the piano reduction], and the resulting impossibility of telling you the real reason why I have so disproportionately much proofreading to do that I still haven't found time for the chamber orchestra arrangement of my Orchestra Pieces ... this is why I had to withdraw a bit of late.

As was the case for the eight-hand piano arrangement (discussed above), further evidence of the planned arrangement for chamber ensemble is found in Berg's Particell (A-Wn F 21 Berg 12, folio 18; facsimile in Chapter 7), again on the first page of the Marsch. The upper left corner of the page shows "III Kammerorchester bearb[eitung]" (crossed out) and a staff disposition and instrumentation list (also crossed out) slightly different from that of 74/xiv: "Fl (auch Picc), Ob (auch EH), Kl in B [cf. A] (auch Bß Kl), Horn in F, Schlagwerk [], Harmonium, Klavier, 1. 2. G, 3. G auch Br., Vcl. and Kß". (An arrow repositions the percussion between harmonium and piano in the proposed staff layout.) Neither of these proposed chamber ensemble arrangements materialized.

The Berg-Schoenberg Relationship Revisited

Felix Greissle, Schoenberg's son-in-law, relates the following anecdote concerning preparations for a Verein concert, which succinctly conveys the changed (perhaps, also, the unchanged) nature of Berg's relation to Schoenberg:23
NOTE TO USERS
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facsimile (p.5) of the theoretical trifle—what he calls "Berg's master array of the interval cycles"—and shows some of its manifestations in Berg's work.²⁵

Some prototypical instances of progressions in interval-cycle segments, both singly and in combination, are disclosed in my analysis of Opus 6. Such procedures are characteristic of Berg's obsession with surface voice-leading combinations in his atonal works (and, later on, with the generation of interval-cycle segments and other quasi-tonal resources via the partitioning and permutation of twelve-tone rows); preoccupation with such matters is less characteristic of Schoenberg, though progression by ic-segments has compositional precedents in his early extended-tonal works, the works with which Berg was particularly familiar.

Such developing compositional independence aside, it was the fate of Opus 6, and specifically Schoenberg's failure to promote the work, that continued to bother Berg in the early 1920s. He was still expressing his concerns to Helene a mere three months before the eventual orchestral premiere (29-03-23, Berg 1971: 320):

[Schoenberg] has already recommended my concerto [Chamber Concerto; still very much in its planning stages] to several ensembles, and had even asked a fee for me. He has also sent out some Wozzeck cards [invitations to subscribe to the vocal score], and has asked for new ones. This is all very kind and may do me some good (though I doubt it, as the people he's going to are mostly without any influence); but it all goes on with such an air of tutor to apprentice[,] even orders from higher authority, that I feel more annoyed than pleased. And he also has an air of doing something rather special instead of the most natural and effective thing. For instance, he recommends my concerto, which doesn't even exist yet, to an ensemble in Copenhagen, in fact he is already asking for an advance on it; instead of recommending the Pieces for Orchestra, which have been finished quite a while, to some important German or Austrian conductor. With the name he has today, that would be enough to get them performed.
Opus 6 and Universal Edition

Schoenberg advised Berg in his negotiations with Emil Hertzka for publication of his works through Universal Edition. These negotiations focused on Wozzeck; throughout the process, however, Berg insisted on the inclusion of Opus 6. Agreement to proceed was achieved at the end of March 1923, as Berg's letter to Helene indicates (31-03-23, Berg 1971: 322):

So Hertzka accepts me for Universal Edition (it's now been agreed). He's doing everything to achieve this, and of course (the dangerous thing!) as cheaply as he can. He made me certain proposals which might be called more favourable for the author, in consideration of my having the vocal score [of Wozzeck] engraved myself. But it'll take me several years to get all my money back—unless it should turn out a colossal success, in which case, of course, I might get it all back, and more, within a year. He offers me a share in the music material necessary for performances, and royalties on the libretto and score. I'll go through all his suggestions, comparing them with my former rough contract, a good deal less favourable, which came to nothing. I'll also go through them with Schoenberg tomorrow, then make my counter-proposals. Of course nobody can guarantee that we'll find a theatre. But Hertzka has very good connections, and as he has to put in six million Crowns [about $85] for printing the material [i.e., parts], he too has the very greatest interest in recovering his expenses by finding a theatre for the production. Munich would be first choice, which would normally be very fine. He also undertakes to start on the printing at once, directly I hand him the work (that's very important!), and to print my Pieces for Orchestra.

The next day, Berg did talk with Schoenberg, who felt that Hertzka's terms were unacceptable. Berg, however, feared negotiations would terminate altogether if he replied along those lines. In any case, Berg felt that "Schoenberg didn't give much time to the matter" and that he would again ask Alma Mahler's advice.27

Alma Mahler eventually received the dedication of Wozzeck for her assistance. One of her main roles was the wining and dining of the principals.
through the negotiating process, as is documented in Berg’s subsequent letters to Helene (this one 10–04–23, Berg 1971: 328):

Only a short letter today, as the discussions with Hertzka have begun. They started in the evening at Almschi’s, a sort of social prelude. ... They talked a lot about Wozzeck, the chances in Mannheim, the very favourable article which has just appeared in [Die] Musik [Viebig 1923] (haven’t seen it yet, but will send it you directly I get it), etc., etc. In short Almschi did everything to charm Hertzka, after they’d been nearly enemies for years. Hertzka became very keen, so tomorrow I start the difficult mission proper. I say tomorrow, but it’s already today, 2:45 a.m. I came home from Almschi’s a quarter of an hour ago .... . Anyhow I believe everything possible has been done to ‘soften Hertzka up’. Now the business part begins, and that won’t be finished in our first talk!

The evening was peculiar. At first very pleasant and jolly. Food simple, but what drinks! ...

Contrary to Berg’s expectations, the “business part” concluded quite expeditiously! The next day’s letter to Helene reported (11–04–23, Berg 1971: 329):

I have come to an agreement with Hertzka. On the whole it has turned out more favourable than I expected a week or two ago. ... I am very confident now that there will be a worthy first production next season. And the Three Orchestra Pieces, too, will definitely be published in the autumn.

Berg signed his contract with Hertzka on Friday, 13–04–23. The same afternoon Berg’s student F.H. Klein came around “to ask about the score of the Orchestra Pieces, whose reproduction he [would] be supervising (paid by Hertzka).” The following morning Berg reported many sudden career developments to Helene (14–04–24), developments which included the forthcoming publication and first orchestral performance of Opus 6: 

Concluded the contract with Hertzka about Wozzeck and the Orchestral Pieces. I told you about the first already; the second is favourable beyond all expectations. (More favourable, anyhow, than he usually agrees to with orchestral pieces, and in consideration of his
getting *Wozzeck* so cheaply.) I have a good feeling, even though I haven't seen much money yet (he gave me a small advance, 3,000,000 Crowns [$42]). In any case my career, which has stood still for fifteen years, will now advance with great strides. First, the libretto is being published presently in a very pretty format. Second, the music material will appear at latest for the beginning of the 1923 season. Third, the *Pieces for Orchestra* appear in facsimile edition, thus exactly a photograph of the dedication copy (some time ago for Schoenberg) beautifully written out by me; that means a sort of collector's edition, and what's most important, without any mistakes. Fourth, he wants to take the *Quartet* soon, and the *Pieces for Clarinet*. But on that I mean to wait till I hear from New York. Perhaps I can sell it there better. Fifth, Hertzka is going to Germany tomorrow to start publicity. Sixth, in Berlin at the beginning of June an Austrian Music Week is taking place, wherein Pella will perform Mahler's Eighth twice, Jalowetz *Gurrelieder* twice and Zemlinsky his new Cantata, and, as good as certain, Webern's *Passacaglia* and my *Pieces for Orchestra*. At least I was told this as a fact, agreed on yesterday at Mödling between Schoenberg and Pella.

Two days later (16–04–23), Berg began to look through the score of Opus 6, which he said he had to "polish up a bit for the photographic reproduction." From this comment, it would appear that the 1923 published edition should be *identical* to Berg's 1914–15 'polished-up' fair copy, but this is, in fact, not the case. Nachlaß item A-Wn F 21 Berg 142 consists of 93 single-page proofs for Opus 6. Had the reproduction been taken from Berg's fair copy, the 1923 edition would have shown numerous errors of the type which, as Berg says in relation to *Wozzeck*, "one has missed in the fury of composition or put off till later (letter to Helene, Berg 1971: 324)." By way of illustration, a single case in point: the tuba pitch D2 that sits at the bottom of the *Klangfarbenakkorden* in mm.9–10 of the *Praeludium* was inadvertently omitted from the fair copy; the note was added to the correction proofs (where it therefore looks slightly different than its surroundings) and appears in the 1923 edition. Overall, the proofs show that Berg (with Klein's assistance) took the opportunity not only to query and to clarify numerous details of the
photographic reproduction quality, but also to correct notes, accidentals, performance instructions, articulations, dynamics, etc.—in short, the original fair copy was subjected to detailed editorial revision. No doubt a carefully doctored second set of proofs then served as the basis for the photo-reproduction of the 1923 edition. The fair copy itself (now in the Cary collection at the Pierpont Morgan Library, US-NYpm) shows none of these changes.

According to the Verlagskartei of Universal Edition, the first edition of Berg’s Opus 6, a printing of 60 copies, appeared 15–06–23, with plate number U.E. 7396. We can assume that Webern worked from an advance copy of the score, because he had conducted the orchestral premiere ten days earlier.

**First Orchestral Performance**

The first orchestral performance of Opus 6 took place June 5th, 1923 (05–06–23) in Berlin, in the Philharmonie hall, Bernburger Strasse 22-23. For reasons we will note in a moment, only the first two pieces were performed. One assumes that the orchestral parts used for this performance were those copied by Berg and Kassowitz in 1919–20. They would, of course, have to have been revised (probably by Klein) to match the editorial revisions found in the page proofs. Universal Edition owns a single-page “Liste der Materials,” undated, which matches the orchestral disposition and parts list found in Berg’s Particell.

As was mentioned earlier, Heinrich Jalowetz and Paul Pella had organized an Austrian Music Week in Berlin. In addition to performances of Schoenberg’s Gurrelieder and Mahler’s Eighth Symphony a “Novitäten-Abend [Evening of Novelties]” included in its program: Orchestral Songs by Bittner and Zemlinksy (Maeterlincklieder, op. 13), Steuermann’s piano
reduction of Schoenberg's Chamber Symphony, Webern's Passacaglia, op. 1 and Berg's Drei Orchesterstücke. The three-way correspondence has a number of exchanges concerning the preparations for this event and the Nachlass contains several of Berg's trip-related documents.35

Berg wrote to Schoenberg concerning the progress of the rehearsals (02–06–23):36

The first rehearsal is over and it went very well and also provided an overview of the subsequent schedule. First Webern rehearsed his Passacaglia; that went 'like clockwork,' so that after a scant 1 1/4 hours he had already made good progress and with just a little work in the coming rehearsals is sure to achieve a wonderfully clear performance. — —My pieces came after the break: a read-through of the 1st (Präludium) and then focusing on a few particularly difficult passages. So that it was already beginning to take shape. In any event I realized that all of it is certainly feasible: to be sure, given such a fabulous orchestra as this one. The most difficult phrases are played with a purity and unerring accuracy of pitch(!) that I would never have thought possible. Of course shading and working out individual parts is a lot of work. But, as I said, was already fairly successful in the 1st piece.—The IIInd piece, on the other hand and to my surprise, seem securely orchestrated after the 1st read-through. But here Webern hasn’t begun to polish anything yet. There wasn’t time. The IIIrd piece already sounded clear in the 1st read-through, but had to be cut off when the rehearsal ended.

The upshot is that probably only 2 pieces will be done. (Ist and IIInd). So that at least their main outline will be intelligible. Because if they’re not, there would be no doubt a scandal. I fear that as it is. For they really are still very unusual, “tame” as I thought them.—Well, we’ll see. I’ll give you a brief progress report of the coming rehearsals.— ...

... The orchestra is fantastic: the wind players (horns!!), the contrabass players. And how precisely they follow dynamic markings!! Quite automatically, out of pure respect for the parts (though these [Berg is speaking here of the parts for Mahler’s Eighth Symphony] are poorly written). These instrumentalists are enthusiastic in a way we Viennese cannot even comprehend.

The day after the concert, Berg sent Schoenberg another full report (06–06–23 B–S):
The concert yesterday went splendidly. Program order: Bittner songs, Chamber Symphony. Intermission, Zemlinsky songs, Berg pieces, Passacaglia. The Bittner songs were the least successful. The Chamber Symphony made a colossal hit. Only then did the audience really become interested. Steuermann had a tremendous success and took countless bows. Zemlinsky enjoyed the greatest success of the evening. The audience wouldn't stop applauding until the last song was repeated. But then, the performance was fantastic. [In a footnote Berg says: "Zemlinsky rehearsed for 2 hours in the morning, so that in the last rehearsal there was barely time to read through my 2 pieces."] Thus primed, the audience received my 2 pieces very calmly and, by all appearances, with warm interest. But then Webern had both audience and orchestra so completely under his spell that a performance resulted such as no one would have thought possible given so few rehearsals (3 1/2 hours in all). I took several bows too, some with Webern and some alone. Finally, Webern was also immensely successful with his Passacaglia. The generally successful concert came to an end at 10:15.—

Berg’s binder file of programs and press clippings for Opus 6 (A-Wn F 21 Berg 3135) begins with Webern’s performance. The file contains the advance notice for the festival week, the program for this premiere, and two reviews. In the first review, Adolf Weissmann, grateful for the evening as a whole, sensed the influence of Debussy in Berg’s blurred contours, and felt that the choice of instrumental colours contributed to the disintegration of polyphonic lines, that the tonality was volatile. He felt that Berg spoke more freshly in Präludium-Reigen, Webern more constrainedly in his Passacaglia. "Webern," Weissmann writes, "creates and conducts as if in cramp." In the second review, Karl Holl, writing in the Frankfurter Zeitung 25-07-23, was less favourable. Holl felt that the pieces’ "wholly aphoristic, crumbled substance was pasted over with an excess of colour, whereby a cheap phantasm of sounds was unable to persuade one of their other than background quality."
The Revised Score and related matters

Following this orchestral debut, Berg undertook a proofing of the score and parts in the hopes of additional performances. The Alban Berg Stiftung now possesses some of the evidence of this process. A "Korrekturzettel" in Berg's hand lists for U.E. errors in the score that also need to be collated with the parts: "Fehler in der Partitur (event. in Stimmen ergänzen)." The document consists of six folios of 15-line manuscript (apparently 30-line half sheets), with the date 02-08-25. Berg also indicates that he would like the corrections transcribed into a few copies of the score and that he will undertake a more thorough revision once rehearsals are underway (noting that "the 3rd piece, that is half of this Opus 6, has after all not yet been played"). (A summary of the principal instrumentation changes that occurred between editions is undertaken below.)

Another document from this period, apparently a list of packing items (A-Wn F 21 Berg 479/505), includes an inventory of Berg's compositions: "Notiz; alles von mir op.1..."; the list of works includes an entry for "Op. 3 Orch. Stück[e] fertig korr. Bürstenabzüge •••". Since the list also includes the Lyric Suite and the song "Schliesse mir" but not yet Der Wein; it must date after 1927 but before the summer of 1929. Despite this date, the "brushproofs [Bürstenabzüge]" for Opus 6 are probably a reference to Berg's retained copy of the 1923 page proofs rather than to any document which represents a subsequent stage of his revision of that edition.

Berg refers to those later revisions in a letter to Schoenberg from 1929 (07-05-29):

Recently—aside from the usual unfruitful Vienna activity—I have been very busy with revisions and the like. To prevent singers and conductors in future Wozzeck performances from doing their own..."
arbitrary 'arranging', I have added 'ossias' to all the vocal parts where it might be necessary.

I also revised the 3 Orchestra Pieces: Schüler in Oldenburg, who will be able to rehearse them adequately and is competent to do so, will perform them next season; that, and Hertzka's intention to produce usable parts, motivated me to do this.

A letter to Schoenberg from December of 1929 (05-12-29) relates another tale of proofreading woes and refers to the preparation of new orchestral parts for Opus 6:

... the Wozzeck parts (which we've needed for months) only appeared in print a few days ago, resulting in endless proofreading for me (and my students). That was likewise the case with the (newly written) parts for the aria [Der Wein] and the 3 Orchestra Pieces, which Schüler in Oldenburg is performing for the first time in their entirety and with my revisions.

The revisions to which Berg refers are compiled in A-Wn F 21 Berg 141, a copy of the 1923 edition of the score bound into hardcovers (27 cm x 34 cm) of the same 'finger-painting-like' abstract brush design as the covers used to bind the Particell. The spine has the following embossed title: "Dre: Orchesterstücke Revid. Partitur". As was indicated in Chapter 3, Rosemary Hilmar's catalogue description of this document as "apparently a correction copy of Berg's [offentlich ein Korrekturexemplar Bergs] (1980, 52)" seriously undervalues its significance. Berg had the copy bound in the same manner as his Particell, because for Berg this document, like the Particell, was the piece; i.e., the composer considered the document a complete representation of the composition, a source that could be used as an arbiter in later editorial decisions: in fact, the 'Fassung letzter Hand' for Opus 6.

The document contains a myriad of corrections, absolutely overwhelming in their colourful variety: red ink, blue ink, graphite pencil, red pencil, green pencil, purple pencil, blue pencil, cerise pencil, orange-red
pencil, and brown pencil. The colour schemes do not appear systematic in their application, though they may have at one time been intended to demarcate layers or stages of the correction process. The principal changes made in this "revised score" concern its instrumentation; these are discussed below. Many other changes concern notes and accidentals, articulations, dynamics, tempo indications, and instructions to players. Though most of these are minor, the sheer bulk of them is remarkable. Their careful consideration will form a major component of the task of preparing a proper historical-critical edition of Opus 6 for Berg's Complete Works.

Berg's student/editorial-assistant team included: Gottfried Kassowitz, F.H. Klein, Fritz Mahler, and Josef Schmid, as well as the copyist Eugene Wolf, but principal responsibility for Opus 6 (as well as for the string orchestra arrangement of movements from the Lyric Suite) fell to Otto Jokl (1891–1963) and the overall supervisor of most projects, from 1928 until Berg's death, was Julius Schloß (1902–1972). Correspondence with Jokl relevant to Opus 6 in the Nachlass includes: F 21 Berg 901/12 (15-07-29) concerning the Präludium and the Particell, 901. 14 (30-07-29) concerning the harp part (see discussion under instrumentation below), and 901/16 (21-08-29) concerning the urgency of the editorial production schedule given the impending performance by Johannes Schüler in Oldenburg. Berg's correspondence with Schloß does not concern Opus 6 directly, though later documentary evidence at Universal Edition (noted below) reveals that he at least acted as executive officer in the process. Schloß brought Hans Erich Apostel (1901–1972) onto the team during the editing of Der Wein; Apostel later became the chief editorial consultant to Universal Edition for the editions of Berg's works, including Opus 6, that appeared during the 1950s and 60s.36

Another curious document from this period is the Willi Reich 'copy' of the 8-hand piano arrangement of Opus 6 (A-Wn S.m. 34.206/1).37 The item is
amateurishly written and incomplete in many places. (A brief description was given in Chapter 3 in Figure 3.3 and the commentary following it.) The document may reflect a score-study assignment Berg designed for Reich in preparation for the Oldenburg premiere. Reich began his biographical studies of Berg around this time, a reflection of the composer's vastly increased public stature due to the success of Wozzeck (premiered in Berlin, 14–12–25).

That success also took Berg's relationship with Schoenberg to another level. Schoenberg, perhaps not without a tinge of jealousy, was quite taken with the idea that the opera might be a "hit". Still the blunt pedagogue, however, he was not beyond communicating his criticisms of the opera's production, performance, and compositional infelicities. Throughout this period (1925–29) Berg's newer compositional projects continued to reveal his greater independence from Schoenberg, the development of his own characteristic approaches to twelve-tone techniques and formal design: the programmatic "motto", secret character-piece variations, and combinative formal conceits of the Chamber Concerto; the all-interval row, partitioning and invariance schemes, and the disposition of motives in complementary rhythm of the Lyric Suite.

Schoenberg's public show of his pride in his pupil's achievements took the form of the Bekenntnis which appeared in the program booklet for the Düsseldorf production of Wozzeck. Berg expressed his humble appreciation with the following declaration (11–04–30 B–S): "living up to that and only that which you expressed in such wonderful words shall be my lifelong 'endeavor', 'until the last hour'. — — — — — — — ." The same letter continues: "Tonight we'll be in Oldenburg, where tomorrow I'll attend rehearsals of the 3 Orchestra Pieces, I'm already very excited at the prospect. The performance is on Monday, ...."
First Complete Performances

The premiere performance of the complete Opus 6 took place April 14th, 1930 (14-04-30), with the Landesorchester of Oldenburg under the baton of Johannes Schüler. Berg entrusted Schüler with the premiere of Opus 6 because of the skill the conductor had shown in preparing a production of Wozzeck the previous year (05-03-29). That production was particularly important for Berg because it showed that smaller provincial opera houses could mount successful performances of the work. Correspondence in the Nachlaß reveals that Schüler informed Berg of his intention to take up Opus 6 a month after the Wozzeck production. Berg's binder file of programs and news clippings (A-Wn F 21 Berg 3135) contains a list of Oldenburg's 1929-30 concert season and half-a-dozen reviews. Schüler's ten-concert season is amazingly ambitious and would merit a separate study—performances of works by Strauss, Reger, Pfitzner, Kodaly, Erhard, Schreker, Braunfels, Debussy, Cassado, Sgambati, Milhaud, Webern (op. 10), and Toch. Berg's pieces shared a program with Hindemith's Violin Concerto (Josef Wolfstahl, soloist) and Beethoven's Eighth Symphony.

An extensive review, excerpts from which are quoted below, appeared in the Oldenburg Nachrichten für die Stadt und Land (15-04-30):45

... The Three Pieces for Orchestra, which received their premiere performance yesterday—in what was termed a new arrangement—date from before "Wozzeck," and in colour and structure are written in a style no less bolder or modern. The inner relationships are so distant that it is often scarcely possible to follow the realization of the compositional expression in many single passages let alone in the different parallel ones. Again and again in the three-part succession of the orchestral suite sonorous effects and turns of phrase came forth that directly conjured up the sculpted scenic impressions found in "Wozzeck", and with the same instrumental means.

...
Now, one may hold different opinions on Alban Berg—and this goes for his "Wozzeck" as well. But one must generally acknowledge, and no one will contest, that there operates here an artistic personality who—in contrast to other advocates of the "new" direction—is unconditionally serious in what he creates, and concerning whom the claim of such seriousness may be raised and can be taken seriously.

For the Orchestral Pieces this [seriousness] serves on the one hand the full purpose of musical expression, and on the other hand a strong thematic logic and compositional architecture—due also essentially, and to be sure to no small extent in hindsight, to the extraordinarily careful and deliberate choice of means. The three movements, particularly the Präludium, are not perhaps written for their playability, but have rather been worked out in a symmetrical construction, though not without content and magnitude. Alban Berg is not one who speaks music in order to speak—he is one of the few today, who also actually intends to say something.

... The performance of both modern pieces by our Landesorchester was worthy of the highest praise; it was plainly distinguished. Particularly in the rendition of Alban Berg's Orchestral Suite Landesmusikdirektor Schüler surrendered himself—one would like to say: with an almost fanatically ardent zeal. So every sonorous shade made imposing effect; the frequently extended soloistic entries of woodwind and brass were particularly praiseworthy, the players showing themselves brilliantly capable of the arduous tasks. The strings followed concert master Volkmar Fledens's lively lead with outstanding precision. A mighty piece of work was performed here.

... In his report to Schoenberg (24-04-30 B-5; Brand, Hailey, Harris 1987, 401) Berg acknowledged: "J. Schüler's performance of my Orchestral Pieces was absolutely fantastic (after 4 1/2 full three-hour rehearsals, to be sure) and I very much wish you could have been there!"

Additional reviews appeared in the *Oldenburger Volksblatt* (16-04-30) and the *Oldenburger Landeszeitung* (19-04-30), as well as in the *Weser Zeitung* of Bremen (19-04-30) and the Berlin newspaper *Germania* (04-05-30); in addition a summary notice on the 1929/30 Oldenburg season also appeared in the *Allgemeine Musikzeitung, Berlin-Südende* (03-10-30).
Unlike the Nachrichten review quoted above, the other four reviews comment on the disruptive presence of a claque of hecklers armed with noisemakers. Apparently, however, Schüler was able to silence them with the intensity of his orchestra's performance.

Evidence of another early performance of Opus 6 is also found in Berg's clippings file. A notice from the Allgemeine Musikzeitung, Berlin-Südende (24–10–30) reports a performance of Präludium and Reigen took place at the Philharmonie in Warsaw (10–10–30) under the direction of Gregor Fitelberg (1879–1952). One binder sheet also contains a newspaper notice for the projected 1930/31 season of the Vienna Philharmonic; the headline reads "Was Clemens Krauß in den Philharmonischen Konzerten bringt" with subheading "Reiches Programm von Bach bis Berg" [the underlining added in pencil]. The Vienna performance, however, did not materialize.

The next complete performances took place in Winterthur under Hermann Scherchen. Scherchen had been interested in the pieces for some time and had been largely responsible for the concert success of the Dre: Bruchstücke aus Wozzeck. Berg's clippings binder contains the Musikkollegium Winterthur General-Program for the Winter 1930–31 season. The Opus 6 pieces were performed (10–10–31) in the Winterthur Stadthaußsaal on the first of four "Studien-Aufführungen" dedicated to contemporary works. Opus 6 shared a program with works by Darius Milhaud, Otto Sturany (Winterthur contrabassoonist), Rudi Stephan (1887–1915), and Wladimir Vogel (Berlin Busoni student). A review of the Winterthur season, including comments on Opus 6, is found in the Schweizerische Musikzeitung. Berg did not attend Scherchen's performance of Opus 6; he was in Leipzig for a production of Wozzeck (11–10–31).
Instrumentation and Performance Practice

Instrumentation lists and tabulations of the requirements for parts and personnel are found in several Opus 6 sources. One list is attached to folio 1v of Berg's Particell; a smaller piece of paper tabulates the parts and personnel requirements: “Stimmen: 17 Holz, 15 Blech, 6 Schlagwerk, 4 Xyl, Glock, Harfe Celesta, 7, 7, 6, 5, 5 [Streich]Quintett” for a total of 72, with 102 players (“mindestens 102 Mann”) given the string contingent of 14.14.12.10.10 and the expectation of at least 6 percussionists. Berg’s autograph score and fair copy (US-NYpm) also contain complete instrumentation lists at the beginnings of the documents as well separate listings for the individual pieces (the Reigen and Marsch settings placed at the end and beginning of their respective fascicles). We have also encountered, above, the autograph “Liste der Materials” which tabulates players and parts for the 1923 edition. A summary of the changes between the 1914/1923 version of the score and the 1929/1954 revised version is undertaken in Figures 6.1 and 6.2 (on the next pages).
Figure 6.1: Instrumentation List as found in 1923 edition
1923 edition [with reference to 1914 listing]

Besetzung des Orchesters

4 Große Flöten (auch Kleine im II. und III. Stück)
4 Oboen (4. auch Englisch-Horn im I. und III. Stück)
4 Klarinetten in A (3. auch in Es im II. Stück und in D in III. Stück)
1 Baßklarinette in B
3 Fagotte
1 Kontra-Fagott

6 Hörner in F
4 Trompeten in F (3. und 4. auch in tief B im I. Stück)
4 Posaune (1. Alt-, 2. Tenor- und 1. Baß-)
1 Kontra-Baß-Tuba

1 große Trommel, 1 kleine Trommel
1 Paar Becken (auch 1 freihangend und 1 an der großen Trommel befestigt)
1 großes Tamtam, 1 kleines Tamtam ["Gong hoch" in 1914 listing]
2 Paar Pauken
Außerdem 1 Rührtrommel und 1 Triangel im II. und III. Stück und 1 Großer
Hammer (mit nicht metallischem Klang) im III. Stück
Glockenspiel, Xylophon, Harfe ["(eventuell Klavier)" in 1914 listing], Celesta

Streichquintett (stark besetzt) [as specified in 1914 listing]
1. Gg. (14)
2. Gg. (14)
Br. (12)
Vcl. (10)
KBß (10)

H" bedeutet Hauptstimme  N" bedeutet Nebenstimme
Figure 6.2: Instrumentation List as found in 1954 edition.
1954 edition [with reference to 1929 revised score]

**ORCHESTERSBESETZUNG**

4 Große Flöten (auch kleine Flöte im II. und III. Stück)
4 Oboen (4. auch Englisch-Horn im I. und III. Stück)
4 Klarinetten in A (3. auch in Es im II. und III. Stück)
Baßklarinette in B
3 Fagotte
Kontrabass-Tuba

6 Hörner in F
4 Trompeten in F
4 Posaune (3 Tenor- und 1 Baßposaune)
Kontrabaß-Tuba

Große Trommel, kleine Trommel
1 Paar Becken (eines auch freihängend und eines an der großen Trommel befestigt)
Großes Tamtam, kleines Tamtam
2 Paar Pauken
Rührtrummel und Triangel im II. und III. Stück
Großer Hammer (mit nicht metallischem Klang) im III. Stück, Glockenspiel, Xylophon
Celesta
2 Harfen

Streichquintett (stark besetzt)


\[ H^\uparrow \text{ bedeutet Hauptstimme} \quad N^\uparrow \text{ bedeutet Nebenstimme} \]
\[ \text{deren Ende durch} \quad \uparrow | \text{ bezeichnet ist} \]

\[ \uparrow \text{ bedeutet, daß die so bezeichnete Stimme im gleichen Rhythmus (akkordtonbildend) mit einer Haupt- (H^\uparrow) oder Nebenstimme (N^\uparrow) geht, diese aber durchzulassen hat.} \]
\[ \text{Alles andere hat begleitend zurückzutreten.} \]

\[ \text{Die Stücke I (Praeludium) und II (Reigen) können eventuell auch allein,} \]
\[ \text{ohne das Stück III (Marsch), aufgeführt werden.} \]

Aufführungsdauer: Praeludium 4 Min.
Reigen 4 1/2-5 “
Marsch 8 1/2-9 “

\[ \text{17-18 Min.} \]
A comparison of Figures 6.1 and 6.2 reveals that, apart from minor discrepancies in orthography and page layout, the principal instrumentation changes between the two editions are: (1) the E-flat clarinet, already employed in *Reigen*, replaces the D clarinet that Berg specified in the 1914 score and 1923 edition for the *Marsch*; (2) the brief switch from F to low B-flat trumpets called for in a *Präludium* passage in the 1923 edition (trumpets 3 and 4, m.40, b.4 through m.42, b.1) is eliminated from the revised score and the passage slightly rewritten; (3) the original alto clef notation for the alto trombone is recast in tenor clef and the first trombone becomes a tenor; an explanatory note from Apostel concerning performance options due to the fact that the register remains unchanged is appended; and (4) the single harp part has been rearranged for two harps and the provision in the 1914 score for the part’s possible realization on piano (“eventuell Klavier”) is dropped. Each of these changes receives further comment in our next paragraphs.50

**Clarinet:** The D clarinet was the German-continental optional equivalent of the high E-flat clarinet, the latter more exclusively favoured in England (and, recall Berlioz, in France). Berg inherited the D instrument from Strauss (e.g., *Till Eulenspiegel*), Mahler (e.g., Sixth Symphony, which uses both E-flat and D instruments, and was one of Berg’s favourite works) and Schoenberg (e.g., *Gurrelieder* and *Pelleas und Melisande* call for the E-flat clarinets, but Berg’s favourite, the Chamber Symphony, has the player move from D clarinet to E-flat clarinet and back). By the mid-1920s, however, the D instrument had fallen into disuse, so Berg transposed all the D-instrument passages in the *Marsch* so that they were scored for E-flat clarinet; this change was accomplished in the ‘Fassung letzter Hand’ by means of paste-overs.

**Trumpet:** It is well known that trumpet players regularly use whatever instrument is available regardless of the transposition level called for by the composer. However, the large-bore valved trumpet in F (“Ventil-Trompete”)
is quite distinct in tone from the modern narrow-bore B-flat, C and A instruments, and it was preferred in many late nineteenth century scores. Berg's writing for trumpets does not entirely avoid the upper register: see, for example, the C6 at the climax of the Präludium, m.36, and the swarming Bb5's at the end of the Marsch—the latter note, incidentally, far from easy to produce on the F instrument. However, much of the scoring is in the mid to low range of the instrument and sounds rather muffled and thick on a modern trumpet; whereas the older instrument, though particularly renowned for its upper-register power, can show greater low-register weight and clarity than its modern counterpart. In the Präludium passage cited above, Berg wished to continue the returning "interjection idea" on trumpets. The passage went below pitch A3 (notated E3)—the practical lower limit for full chromatic action on the F instrument—so Berg called for a change to "low B-flat [tie B]" for players three and four.

It is not entirely clear what the composer envisioned: the "low B-flat" call would normally invite the player to switch to a valveless natural trumpet in low B-flat; as in Berg's score, that instrument sounds, like the modern B-flat instrument, a major second lower than notated (i.e., it is not, therefore, a Wagnerian "bass trumpet" which, when in B-flat, transposes down a ninth). The passage goes down chromatically to E3 (notated F#3), which the natural trumpet would not have been able to do. The passage is playable on a B-flat cornet ("Cornet à pistons" or "Ventil-Kornett"); perhaps Berg was thinking of that instrument or envisioned crooking the F valve trumpet in some fashion; alternatively, and somewhat ironically, he may have been thinking of the modern B-flat instrument (which is 'lower' than the F instrument in transpositional scheme) and can play chromatically down to the E3 the passage requires. In any case, in his 1929 revision, Berg redistributed and
slightly recast the third and fourth trumpet parts for second and third trombones, and thus avoided the trumpet change.

_Trombone:_ The original score called for alto first trombone. In the 1929 revision, Berg leaves a note for the copyist to change the part to tenor clef, stating that the score can remain in alto clef. The part itself, however, remains unchanged; therefore, some of the moments of extremely high alto register become practically impossible on tenor. Most prominent amongst these is of course the Eb5 Hauptrhythmus passage in the _Präludium_ (mm.9–11). To be sure, modern players can coax this note out of a tenor trombone, but the colour quality is not nearly as splendid as it is on the alto. (Stravinsky cites the passage as "one of the noblest sounds Berg or anyone else ever caused to be heard in an orchestra [1959, 73].") For most principal trombonists the present-day solution is to bring two instruments on stage and to use the alto for _Präludium_ m.9ff and m.33ff, and perhaps also for _Reigen_ mm.106–108ff, and for _Marsch_ m.36f, mm.105–107, and mm.111–126 (E5 in m.125f). Players prefer the weight of the tenor in most other passages; in any case, Berg’s original score also severely strained the alto’s lower range: _Präludium_ mm.11–14, for example already uses the instrument’s fundamentals, and an alto player could only imagine the E2 and D2 pedaltones called for in _Marsch_ mm.152–155.

_Harp:_ Berg’s original single harp part was unplayable: there are simply too many rapid chromatic shifts for the pedal changes to be workable. How this impossibility was rectified at Webern’s premiere performance is unknown: perhaps the “eventuell Klavier” option was exercised and the part was rendered on piano. At some point, however, after the 1923 edition and before the 1929 revised score, Berg’s attention was drawn to the problem, and he engaged the services of a harpist in order to redistribute the single part between two players. Accordingly, the ‘Fassung letzter Hand’ (A-Wn F 21)
Berg 141) and the Vorlage copy at the offices of Universal Edition, as well as the third correction copy now at the Pierpont Morgan Library, all bear the following note: "Die Harfenstimme dieser Partitur wurden von Prof. Franz Jelinek von der Wiener Staatsoper für zwei Harfen eingerichtet. Diese zwei Stimmen befinden sich im Orchester-Material." Jelinek's intervention makes Berg's harp parts playable, though they are still awkwardly difficult in many places.

Beyond these fundamental changes in instrumentation, comparison of Figures 6.1 and 6.2 provides some additional information: Berg's suggested numbers—14.14.12.10.10—for the "stark besetzt" string contingent are found only in the 1914-15 score; similarly, the identification of the "kleines Tamtam" with "Gong hoch" found in the 1914 score suggests the sound quality Berg was seeking from this instrument; the greater detail concerning the Haupt- and Nebenstimme markings found in the 1954 edition was transferred directly from Berg's 1929 revised score; the dedication to Schoenberg that appears (in its North-American spelling) at the top of the 1954 page is found on the title page in the 1923 edition; and, finally, the two notes at the bottom of the 1954 page concerning permission for partial performance and the estimated durations do not originate with Berg (they are discussed below).

Apart from the various minor errors noted in the chapters on the individual pieces, there are a number of infelicities in instrumental conception elsewhere in Opus 6: one thinks of the severe registral extrema of the horn and trombone writing, the inevitable maskings due to sheer density, and the occasional wishful thinking in terms of the lower limits of individual instruments. More positively, there are numerous passages in Opus 6 that merit the close attention of orchestration students; a sampling of these would include:
Präludium: opening and closing percussion measures (see Taylor 1989). Klangfarbenakkorden m.9ff with high trombone E-flats and their recomposed return m.42ff, sequential progression mm.20–24, layout of climax m.36ff, Reigen interjection m.44ff and the “striking sonorous invention” of m.49ff.

Reigen: sonority of opening thematic texture; interlocking horn pair and surrounding rhythmic transition to waltz m.14–20, subordinate theme combination of woodwinds and strings m.35ff and reworking at m.56ff, beautiful (Schreker-like) celesta-arpeggiations at return of opening sonority m.41ff, layout of twelve-note climax m.66, orchestral block m.83ff and particularly its reworking m.89ff (“one of the most remarkable noises he ever imagined” Stravinsky 1959, 73) through the retransition to the return of the waltz m.94, solo instrumental statements against reiterated wind chords m.106ff, and the ending from the tuba entrance of enlarged delta motive m.110 through the gradually built-up trilling final chord with its appended statement of motive beta in muted horns and trumpets m.120–121.

Marsch: build-up of the opening texture mm.1–7, tune for strings m.11ff. the effect (though perhaps not the 'harmonic logic') of the 'dive-bomber' string chords in the Transition m.25ff, the bold parallel tutti chords m.60–61 and the tutti texture takeover m.76ff, the charming grazioso m.62ff and the violin-trumpet 'big tune' m.66ff, the layered ostinato retransition m.84ff, the breakout theme of the second half m.91ff, the drive of m.107ff. the scalar creeping in complementary rhythms m.121ff, the layout of the texture around the climax m.126 (and the first of three 'hammer blows' [concerning which see Archibald 1979, 118–119]), the 'bariolages' and swelling chords m.135ff, the disposition and sonority of the 'weird chords' and thematic recapitulations m.143ff, the powerful horn and trombone fanfare and cadence m.149–155, the “flashback” interjection (m.160) and creeping six-part chord
that settles on a ticking D m.165f and the trombone and more fragmentary
subsequent solos against it m.166–170, and, finally, the catastrophic fanfare
with swarming trumpets that concludes the work ("one of the finest things
Berg ever did [Stravinsky 1959, 73]").

The Posthumous Publication of Opus 6

Berg did not live to see the revised score of Opus 6 published. There
were no further performances after those of Schüler and Scherchen during
Berg’s lifetime. Documents related to the posthumous publication history of
Opus 6 were tabulated in Chapter 3, Figure 3.3. This section provides some
additional details.

Berg’s Revised Score. The Fassung letzter Hand document (A-Wn F 21
Berg 141) bears the following somewhat cryptic note in Berg’s hand on its title
retour (Kpfl. Stein) U.E. / zwecks Punkt 3) u. 4. / Df Jokl erhielt von mir
Quelle zu des 5 Particell u / Manuskript der Part.” It is no longer clear to
which contractual or editorial “points” Berg refers; for us, the important point
is that Berg cites the editorial roles of Otto Jokl and Erwin Stein, and that he
acknowledges both the pre-publication status of this document (“Vorlage”) and
the continuing editorial reference back to the Particell as well as to the
autograph score (“Manuskript der Part[itur]”; i.e., presumably Berg’s retained
autograph score [now in the Pierpont Morgan Library], though it had been
superseded by the correction proofs [Berg 142] and their photographic
reproduction as the 1923 edition).

The whereabouts of the orchestral parts used for Webern’s 1923
performance or those used for the performances by Schüler, Fitelberg, and
Scherchen based on this 1929 revision are, according to Universal Edition,
longer known. Other correction copies [Korrektur-exempläre] presumably also existed that were made from Berg’s revised score during the editorial process. One such document is now found in the Cary collection at the Pierpont Morgan Library. The score, like Berg 141, starts from a copy of the 1923 edition; the corrections are, however, not as comprehensive as those in Berg’s revised score. The Cary collection document has an additional footnote on the instrumentation page concerning the use of “Jazz mutes” for the brass; the reference is presumably to “cup mutes” as opposed to the traditional “straight mutes”.

Holdings at the Offices of Universal Edition, Vienna. A bound Korrekturexemplar for Opus 6 is housed at the offices of Universal Edition in Vienna. The exemplar, like Berg’s revised score, takes a copy of the 1923 score as its point of departure. The cover (24 cm x 33.5 cm) has a design of black and white swirls, similar to the covers of Berg’s Particell (F 21 Berg 12) and revised score (F 21 Berg 141). A label sticker bears the title: “ALBAN BERG DREI ORCHESTERSTÜCKE / [a smaller sticker covers over the “Op.6” designation] / PARTITUR.” To the left of the title: “B 36/42” [file numbers?]; to the right “Korrektur Exemplar” in red pencil. Also to the left: “massgebendes Korr. Expl. / Lt. Hr. Stein.” An additional sticker at the bottom of the cover admonishes: “Einzeichnungen nur mit Bleistifte / Nichtrollen !! Nicht knicken !!”, the underlinings and exclamation marks added in blue pencil.

vom Autor geschrieben / und Arnold Schönberg zum 40. Geburtstag überreichten Widmungsexemplars.” Two additional remarks are found below this note. The first states: “Schreibfehlerkorrektur und Instrumentationsretouche wurden / 1929 vorgenommen.” The second, in somewhat thicker pen, is signed by H. E. Apostel: “Eine neuerliche Revision, durch die eine Unzahl / Fehler ausgemertzt würden, würde im Herbst 1953 / vorgenommen. H.E. Apostel”. These entries clarify the two principal layers of revision—1929 (by Berg and Jokl) and 1953 (by Apostel)—and establish that this document served as the basis of the 1954 edition.

However, the preceding entries do not exhaust the annotations enclosed with this exemplar. Inserted into the score, one also finds a front softcover from the 1923 edition. At the top of this cover, in red pencil: “Korrektur-Exemplar!” To the right: “Original / bei Hr. W. Reich / U 24-2-85 [35?]”. This suggests that the original revised score was, at some point, in Willi Reich’s possession after Berg’s death. To the right of the ‘lyre icon’ in the middle of the cover: “Die Korr. dieses / Expl. würden in / das andere Korr. / Expl. von Hr. Schönberg / übertragen, sodan / das andere Korr. Expl. als massgebend zu / betrachten ist. (Lt. / Kapellm. Stein Ill. 1936)”. This comment suggests that the softcover has been kept with this item in order to preserve these memoranda. The reference to Kapellmeister Erwin Stein reflects his role as editorial chief for Universal Edition at the time; the reference to Herr Schönberg is not likely to Arnold Schoenberg, who had of course already emigrated to the United States, but rather to Georg Schönberg, who did editorial work for Universal Edition.

Another note, rather badly faded and torn, to the top left of the softcover reads: “Zur Einrichtungen / Herrn Schloss verständigem / danach verschieden / mit Hr Berg zu / besprechen ist.” This note acknowledges-
NOTE TO USERS

Page(s) not included in the original manuscript are unavailable from the author or university. The manuscript was microfilmed as received.
Ahring, Füssl) and is dated "X.58"; its continuation on the last page of the errata list mentions Schönberg, Kalmus, and Apostel and is dated "20.II.59".

The pocket score is a print of UE 12194. The back cover bears the imprint "Nr. 173 Printed in Austria W 1/57". The score contains numerous corrections in red, green, and regular pencil. Inside are two sheets of paper which tabulate errors in the score; an initial query, in English, reads "Why are figures missing from orch. besetzung?". The large score is a correction copy based on the 1923 edition. A pencil note on the title page mentions Füssl and Apostel and is dated "29.VII 64". This large-score version of Opus 6 served as the basis for the conductor's score as rental material: "Leihmaterial unverkäufliches Eigentum der UNIVERSAL EDITION, A.G., WIEN." An internal UE memo, dated "28.Oktober 1963" explains how such documents came to be placed in the archive: "Anbei ein Partitur, die eine Vorlage-Partitur sein dürfte und vielleicht ins Archiv gehört."

Universal Edition supplied the following information from their Verlagskartei concerning the various edition runs and release dates for Opus 6:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Edition Number</th>
<th>Date Released</th>
<th>Copies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UE 7396, first edition</td>
<td>15-06-1923</td>
<td>60 copies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26-07-1957</td>
<td>1 copy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13-06-1973</td>
<td>1 copy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;further editions&quot;</td>
<td>31-10-1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22-11-1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UE 12194, study score</td>
<td>13-04-1954</td>
<td>1000 copies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16-05-1957</td>
<td>990 copies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29-08-1963</td>
<td>985 copies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28-10-1966</td>
<td>1000 copies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30-01-1970</td>
<td>1911 copies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philharmonia pocket score (Ph. 432)</td>
<td>31-01-1974</td>
<td>994 copies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30-09-1976</td>
<td>1012 copies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30-06-1979</td>
<td>1938 copies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35-14</td>
<td>5886 copies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The "further editions" of UE 7396 in 1978 and 1983 in this listing probably refer to large-format printings of the revised score; there would be no reason to reproduce multiple copies of the 1923 edition at the time. The two additional copies of the 1923 edition were probably produced for in-house use or to fulfill specific requests. Universal Edition is unable to confirm this surmise, but the large folio-format copy which I own of the revised score for Opus 6 bears the same 7396 'plate number' used for the original 1923 edition, though it is of course different at every turn. The number UE 12194 refers, then, exclusively to the small-format study score (a photo-reduction of the larger); the even smaller Philharmonia pocket score replaced it from 1974 on.

*Towards the critical-historical edition.* The task of preparing a proper critical-historical edition of Opus 6 is rather formidable: several years ago, when I first decided to undertake a closer examination of the changes made between the 1923 and 1954 editions of Opus 6, a 'draft critical report'—which was completed for the scores only of the two editions of the *Präludium* only—ran to some twenty pages of single-spaced text. At the time, I was unaware of the pivotal importance of Berg's 1929 *Fassung letzter Hand*. A proper critical edition would take the 1929 revisions as the point of departure and would tabulate the changes made by Berg's early editorial team, which included Otto Jokl and Julius Schloß, and, subsequently, by the various officials working for U.E., the central figure being Hans Erich Apostel. Though one can be confident that Apostel carried out his editorial work for the 1954 edition with great competence, diligence, and good intentions, there is of course no proper critical report. Observations made in this study concerning numerous textual details in the individual pieces demonstrate that the various earlier scores and the Particell must also be consulted in reaching editorial decisions—as is corroborated by Berg's references to such documents on the cover of the *Fassung letzter Hand* and elsewhere.
The Posthumous Performance Revival of Opus 6

The later binder sheets (11 through 22) in Berg's clippings file were added by Helene Berg after the composer's death and they document much of the posthumous performance revival of Opus 6. Universal Edition has record of a London performance in April of 1938; the next record is not until 1950. More detailed information on these performances is not found in the Verlagskartei and external corroboration is, so far, lacking. In the mid-1950s, the post-War revival of interest in the Second Viennese School brought several early advocates of Opus 6, including Hans Rosbaud, Dmitri Mitropoulos, and Norman del Mar. In an article from the Neue Kurier (26-10-56), Harald Kaufmann reviews developments at the Donaueschingen Festival, where Hans Rosbaud, conducting the Southwest German Radio Orchestra, performed Berg's Opus 6 amongst other New Viennese works. The Viennese Arbeiterzeitung (07-10-58) has a quite positive review of the performance by the Wiener Symphoniker under Dmitri Mitropoulos. The same binder page shows two other notices for broadcast performances—without additional information—from the same period, 21-01-58 and 06-12-58. The program sheet for the Vienna Mitropoulos concert, 04-10-58, is also included. An article from the London Observer (06-12-59) reflects on the Mahlerian and Schoenbergian influences on Berg's work in a review of a performance by the Royal Philharmonic Society under Norman del Mar.

Problems continued to plague Opus 6 in its projected Viennese performances: a notice for "Ein Herbert von Karajan Zyklus" (03-11-62) includes Opus 6 in the list of works Karajan is to perform with the Wiener Philharmoniker. However, a typewritten note above the clipping states: "Das Konzert wurde wegen Erkrankung Karajans abgesagt." "Brahms statt Berg" reads the headline in the Express (19-04-66) as the Wiener Symphoniker under Wolfgang Sawallisch replaced Opus 6 with the Brahms Haydn.
Variations—due officially to the "schwer lesbare Fotokopien des Orchester-
materials".

Greater success was had during the 1960s with radio broadcasts,
particularly from England; the binder includes, for example, program notices
for BBC broadcast performances by Ernst Bour and the Southwest German
Radio Orchestra (24–11–66), George Hurst and the North German Radio
Orchestra (12–10–67), and for several performances by Pierre Boulez and the

The composer's nephew, Erich Alban Berg, wrote a short article in the
Kleine Zeitung (04–06–66) concerning a Vienna performance of Opus 6: the
Grazer Philharmoniker under Berislav Klobucar programmed the work
during the Wiener Festwochen. The Wiener Philharmoniker itself finally
performed Opus 6 in the following year as part of their world tour; but the
work was relegated to the small towns portion of the tour, in Montclair near
New York rather than in the big concerts in New York city and Washington
where more conservative fare was featured. While still on tour, however,
the orchestra did perform Opus 6 in Osaka; a notice in the Volksblatt (09–11–
67) for readers back in Vienna reads: "Die Japaner mit Berg 'geschockt'".

Also in the mid 1960s, the works of the New Viennese School began to
be recorded for general release. The binder has a review by Colin Mason that
includes Antal Dorati's performance of Opus 6 with the London Symphony
Orchestra on the Philips label. In 1968, Opus 6 found a new champion in
Claudio Abbado who, at last, successfully performed the work with the
Wiener Philharmoniker. The performance was publicly recognized as a 'first
performance' by the prestigious Viennese ensemble during its regular concert
series. Generally positive reviews appeared in several Viennese papers
(Kurier and Express 25–03–68, Volksblatt and Die Presse 26–03–68, and the
Wiener Zeitung) as well as in the Salzburger Nachrichten 26–03–68.
Belated Viennese success aside, England continued to set the pace for Opus 6 performances: Bernhard Haitink with the London Philharmonic 09-03-71, Edo de Waart with the Halle in Manchester 03-04-72; and in radio performances: Albert Rosen with the BBC Northern Symphony Orchestra 04-06-70, and, again, Pierre Boulez’s 1968 performance was several times re-broadcast (including 18-06-70 and 21-08-71). The binder also contains a review from the Observer (31-12-69) of Boulez’s well-known recording of Berg’s Opus 6, Opus 4 (with Halina Lukomska), and Chamber Concerto (with Daniel Barenboim and Sachko Gawriloff)—CBS 72614.

The last pages of the binder reflect the broader success of Opus 6 in the early 1970s. The entries include: Lorin Maazel, New York Philharmonic, 1972; Karajan, Berlin Philharmonic, 10-01-72 (notice in Der Abend); and Horst Stein, Bayerischen Rundfunks, Süddeutsche Zeitung notice, 24-04-72. Karajan then brought Opus 6 to the 1973 Salzburger Festspiele. The conductor’s predilection for overemphasizing the late-romantic qualities of Berg’s idiom was met with some criticism in the reviews in Die Presse and (29-08-73) and in the Süddeutsche Zeitung (30-08-73); more blandly positive notices appeared in the Kurier and the Kronenzeitung (29-08-73). Karajan’s late-romantic approach to Berg is also noted in a Wochenpresse notice (05-03-75) concerning his Deutsche Grammaphon recording (number 2815 003).

During the same period, Milan Horvath performed Opus 6 with the ORF-Orchester (09-05-73) in Austria and Boulez and the BBC Orchestra had broadcast performances from the Edinburgh Festival (26-08-73), and on tour from Munich (21-05-74) and Düsseldorf (29-05-74).

The final notices in the binder again concern the great success of Claudio Abbado’s performances with the Wiener Philharmoniker: Opus 6, shares the program—in a recollection of its original partial premiere in 1923—with Webern’s Passacaglia, as well as with Schubert’s Second
Symphony, and is now a highlight of the opening concert of the 1974–75 season (notices in Die Presse and Kurier, 30–09–74). Abbado also took Opus 6 to the Salzburg Festival at the end of that season, 27–07–75, where it was programmed between Mozart’s C minor Piano Concerto KV491 (with soloist Clifford Curzon) and Strauss’s Tod und Verklärung.

The clippings binder comes to an end at this point. Activity in the ten years following Helene Berg’s death (10–08–76) climaxed in the many performances associated with Berg centenary celebrations in 1985. From a personal perspective, performances by Andrew Davis and the Toronto Symphony Orchestra and by Claudio Abbado and the Chicago Symphony Orchestra were particularly memorable. Since 1985, performances of Opus 6 have become more or less routine—though no less technically challenging—in the subscription programs of most major symphony orchestras.

In closing this chapter, we pause to reflect on a longstanding performance practice issue for Opus 6. The 1954 score contains the remark that the Marsch may be omitted in performance, the Präludium and Reigen performed alone. The documentary history of this problem is now related.

A typewritten note, dated “19.3.52” is affixed to the endpaper of the Druckvorlage Dokument at the offices of Universal Edition: “Frau Alban Berg ist mit einer neuen Ausgabe der ‘3 Orchesterstücke’ / einverstanden, auch mit dem eventuell geplanten Vermerk, dass die beiden ersten Stücke auch allein gespielt werden können – / – sofern diese allein nicht zu kurz sind. Da wir die Aufführungs – / dauer jedes einzelnen der 3 Stücke nicht kennen, muss somit die / Dauer der beiden ersten Stücke festgestellt werden.” However, a note at the top of the page, written in a blue ink that matches the underlinings in the previous comment states: “Bitte diesen
Vermerk in die Part, aufnehmen.” Nevertheless, the comment did get placed in the 1954 edition.”

Many Berg scholars have wondered at the wisdom of playing anything less than all three pieces, since the thematic correspondences between them are so compelling. The evidence of the U.E.-office note indicates that the option to omit the Marsch was given Helene Berg’s blessing. There is of course some historical precedent for the performance of the Präludium and Reigen on their own, since expediency required exactly that in two cases: Webern’s 1923 Berlin premiere, and Fitelberg’s 1930 Warsaw performance. The testimony of Frau Berg’s inner-circle intimates as to the proverbial performance difficulties of the Marsch, as well as her awareness of these historical precedents, no doubt persuaded her to condone partial performances of Opus 6. This option might now strike most observers as an unnecessary contingency, but the rationale for bringing out the revised edition of the score was to encourage performances of the work; moreover, even a less-than-complete performance would have generated performance-rights revenue.

Berg may well have shared such a practical perspective, but one would be surprised if it represented his artistic and aesthetic preference. On the other hand, one might conclude that the three pieces are, after all, “pieces” not “movements” and that, though their cyclic cross-references—particularly the foreshadow of Reigen in the Präludium, and the “flashback” to the Präludium near the end of the Marsch—speak to a richly integral and compellingly symphonic conception, it is both possible and reasonable to consider their independent study and performance: though rendition of the complete ‘cycle’ remains eminently preferable.
Notes to Chapter 6, Interlude:

1Berg’s war duties are summarized in R. Hilmar 1978, 113–129. Schoenberg was called up 15–12–15 and also served in Vienna from May to October 1916, where he then remained when he was released; he was recalled briefly in December 1917.

2Concerning the circulation of Opus 6, see, for example, Berg’s notebook (A-Wn F 21 Berg 479/5 folio 33v) entry of a loan to “Watz” (i.e., probably Berg’s friend, Hermann Watznauer, rather than his later student, Georg Watza) of “Op. 6 Particelle”. Concerning work on Wozzeck at this time, see Perle 1980 and Petersen 1985 (both correcting E. Hilmar 1975); also see E.A. Berg 1985, 120 (letter to Gottfried Kassowitz 1916) as well as Berg’s letters to Schoenberg (for example, 13–08–17, 23–07–18, 29–07–19).

3Concerning the role of the Chamber Symphony rehearsals in the formation of the Verein, see Ratz 1974 (in E. Hilmar 1974, 69–70); concerning the Schwarzwald School Seminars, see Smith 1986, 159–170.


On the Verein in general, see: Smith 1986, particularly chapter 4, 81–102; Szmolyan 1974 (in E. Hilmar 1974, 76–80) and Szmolyan 1981 [Szmolyan’s list of performances is translated in Smith 1986 (Appendix 3) 255–268]; and Simms 1979. The major portion of Berg’s extensive personal collection of Verein-related documents, including those mentioned in the preceding paragraph, is found in A-Wn F 21 Berg 447/1–554.

5On the Du of 23–06–18, see: 24–06–18 B–S; letter to Helene Berg, 24–06–18 (Berg 1971: 220); on Webern, see Moldenhauer 1979, 156. Also on the subject of conventions of social address is a later exchange on the use of upper or lower case Du forms in correspondence: 08–08–31 S–B and 27–08–31 B–S.

6Program listing in Szmolyan 1981, 87; Smith 1986, 258. The “Propaganda-Abende” were open to the general public; normally, concerts were only open to members of the Verein. See Szmolyan’s supplementary remarks, Szmolyan 1981, 154.


8Schnitzler 1985 Tagebuch 1917-1919, entry for 06-06-19: “Mit O. Opernschule (Fr., Öppelt Zauberflöte) — und dann Concert unter Leitung Schönberg — z. Th. interessant (Stravinsky, einzelnes von Bartok); andres talentlos läppisch (Alban Berg, Webern); Publikum radikal bolschewistisch hasserfüllt und ungewaschen. Beifall und Mißfallenbezeugung verboten. Grosz, der mit uns war, gilt unter diesen Leuten schon als reactionär.”

Berg later marked a few passages in Wilhelm Grosz’s “Baby für die Bar, Erzählung, Bd. 2.3” (U.E. 7523, 1927) when doing his Jazz studies for Der Wein. See R. Hilmar 1985b (Austellungskatalog), item 232.


aus der Aufführung in Dresden ohnehin nichts draus. Aber so ist schon gut, wenn die Stimmen herausgeschrieben sind. Wenn man sie einmal schnell braucht, hat man sie gewöhnlich nicht.” Correspondence from Schoenberg, Webern, and Berg to Schulhoff is published in Vojtech 1965.


13 Concerning Berg’s exchanges with Webern and Schoenberg on Schulhoff, Dresden, etc.:

06–07–19 B–W: “Bin begierig, was Du mit ihm wegen Dresden ausgemacht hast. … [Berg goes on to say that he received some of Schulhoff’s piano music, which he found poor (“always so dance-like”; like bad, “but very bad Bartok”), yet very nicely bound by Jatho/Berlin. He had heard nothing from Dresden or from the publisher, who, through Schulhoff, had expressed interest in his works.] … Auf die großen Schwierigkeiten meiner Orchestersstücke hab’ ich heute schon aufmerksam gemacht. Ich halte es ja auch für sehr fraglich, daß es zur Aufführung kommt.”

15–07–19 W–B: Webern also wrote Dresden and sent them his Orchestra Pieces (op. 6) and Songs (op. 3 and 4); he had also heard nothing, still not by 01–08–19 W–B.

29–07–19 B–S: Berg reports to Schoenberg that he has finished Act I of Wozzeck and a lengthy scene from Act II (probably Scene 4, or possibly Scene 2). He relates various country routines and discusses correspondence. “Apropos letters, the Dresden people (Schulhoff, etc.) actually wish to ‘premiere’ my 3 Orchestra Pieces—despite my warning. Of course, they haven’t seen the score yet. Kassowitz is copying out the parts and needs it just now. So who knows whether it will actually be performed. Anyway, I have serious doubts whether this series of 6 concerts is even going to take place, as well as misgivings about how. …” [See also Brand, Hailey, Harris 1987, 275: notes 1, 4, and 6.]


“Dabei höre ich gar nichts mehr von Dresden, Am End’ ist die ganze Arbeit (die sehr groß ist—3–400 Seiten Stimmen) umsonst.”


Other correspondence in the Nachlaß from Kassowitz to Berg that refers to Opus 6 includes the following letters: A-Wn F 21 Berg 920/1 (07-06-19) on the Verein Performance; 920/19 (28-07-19) on the Präludium, 920/20 (14-07-19) and 920/21 (21-08-19) both concerning Reigen, and 920/22 (12-02-20) concerning copying tasks.

28-10-20 B-S: Berg comments on the Ravel Verein concert 23-10-20. "After all, I wasn't there. At the time my clarinet pieces were being played, my wife was bringing me to the sanatorium by auto. [Berg had additional asthma attacks at the beginning of September and the 22nd of October. He entered the Park Sanatorium from 23-10-20 to 08-11-20.] Incidentally, it was the 23rd. ... Finally, the so-called Sak-Philharmonic (the 2nd Czech orchestra wants to do my orchestra pieces in December." According to Brand, Hailey. Harris 1987, 290 and n11: Sak's orchestra disbanded in 1921.


17-07-22 B-S: "Scherchen wants to perform my Orchestra Pieces. Thank God the parts are already available." Concerning the proofreading work on Wozzeck by Klein and Mahler see Berg 1965: 380-383, and 394-396 (Berg 1971:
310-313, and 323-325).

21. The minutes of the general meeting of the Verein 12-12-19 record the intention to offer a prize for the best work for this type of chamber ensemble (A-Wn F 21 Berg 447/406). The contest for original compositions was largely unsuccessful—only F.H. Klein's work, Die Maschine received a prize. Also, most of the arrangements were automatically ineligible as they were either done by, or under the direct supervision of, the panel of judges (Schoenberg, Berg, Webern, Stein, and Steuermann). See also Simms 1979 and Szmolyan 1981.

22. 24-12-22 B-S: see Brand, Hailey, Harris 1987, 321. Related, too, to these Verein-type ensemble arrangements are Berg's original plans for the Chamber Concerto as a piano concerto, or piano-violin double concerto, with a Verein-type ensemble which included harmonium; see 12-07-23 B-S in Brand, Hailey, Harris 1987, 327.

23. Felix Greissle, as told to Joan Allen Smith, in Smith 1986, 93.

24. The materials for the Schoenberg book are found in the Nachlaß, A-Wn F 21 Berg 101. The correspondence on the subject includes: 12-01-20 S-B, 15-01-20 B-S, 21-02-20 B-S and 08-12-20 S-B (where Berg accepts, in principle, the offer to write a different book). Berg's request for an extension of his vacation in order to work on Wozzeck (24-08-21 B-S) was granted (26-08-21 S-B).

25. The facsimile, with translation of the letter, is now also found in Brand, Hailey, Harris 1987, 283. Perle 1977b—his theory of Twelve-tone Tonalities—is to a large extent, a generalization and extension of Berg's master array of the interval cycles for compositional purposes. Cyclic operations are also a general topic of discussion in Lewin 1987 (which includes an interesting application to the octatonic collection, Appendix B, pp.251-253) and Morris 1987 (which describes twelve-tone operator cycles [TTO cycles], pp.128-135); a convenient summary of "operator cycles" is found in Morris 1991, 63-66.

26. See, for example, 27-01-23 B-S, in which Berg asks advice on U.E.'s rival interest from Schirmer of New York. See also Berg 1971: 320, where Berg first claims that Schoenberg is not "particularly interested in my Wozzeck negotiations with Hertzka—because Wozzeck isn't his."

27. Berg 1971: 323, 31-03-23; continuation, Evening 01-04-23. See also Berg 1971: 325, 05-04-23, where Berg reports drafting the contract, and comments on the advice of both Schoenberg and Alma Mahler, and on the inevitable delays an American offer would entail.

"Berg 1965: 401 (Berg 1971: 330): “Um 2 Uhr kommt Klein hin, fragen wegen der Partitur der Orchesterstücke, deren Autograph er herstellen wird (von Hertzka bezahlt).”

"Berg 1965: 402 (Berg 1971: 331). The English translation of the passages concerning Opus 6 has been rendered more literally. (Berg 1971 is frequently selective.) For convenience, the German for the two relevant passages is given here: “drittens: die Orchesterstücke erscheinen in einer faksimilierten Ausgabe, also genau das von mir so herrlich geschriebene Widmungsexemplar (szt. für Schönberg) photographiert (also quasi Liebhaberausgabe, und was das Wichtigste ist: fehlerlos!). ... Sechstens: In Berlin findet Anfang Juni eine österreichische Musikfestwoche statt, wobei Pella die VIII. Mahler zweimal, Jalowetz die Gurre-Lieder zweimal und Zemlinsky seine neue Kantate und so gut wie sicher Webers Passacaglia und meine Orchesterstücke aufführen wird. Wenigstens erfuhr ich letzteres als eine Tatsache, die gestern in Mödling bei Schönberg mit Pella ausgemacht wurde.”

“Zemlinsky’s new Cantata” may, perhaps, refer to the Lyric Symphony: however, his Mästerlincklieder were performed at the concert.


As was indicated in Chapter 3, Figures 3.2–3.3, R. Hilmar’s 1980 Katalog is in error. Her item 152, listed as Berg 141 is actually Berg 142 (the unbound, galle\-\ys' proof sheets); item 153, listed as Berg 142 is actually Berg 141 (the bound, 1929 revised score). From an editorial perspective, the latter is more than “apparently a correction copy of Berg,” it is the Fassung letzter Hand for Opus 6. Each page of the correction proofs bears a paste-on plate-number sticker: U.E. 7396. The copyright notices correspond to those found in the 1923 edition.

Information supplied by Universal Edition. R. Hilmar 1980 gives 06-06-23 as the first date of publication, i.e. the day after Webern’s premiere.

“Liste der Materials,” Universal Edition, copy supplied through the Alban Berg Stiftung. Though the item is undated, the list of instruments corresponds to the 1923 edition; it also comes with the “Korrekturzettel” tabulation of errors in the score that is dated “2/8 25”. This “Liste” page was
later marked “überholt [superseded] H.E.A. [the initials of Hans Erich Apostel, supervisor of the posthumous 1954 revised edition of Opus 6].”

35 Concerning the Berlin trip correspondence: 16-05-23 W-B, 16-05-23 B-W, 18-05-23 B-S, 22-05-23 W-B, and 02-06-23 W-S as well as 06-06-23 W-S: excerpts from Webern’s reports to Schoenberg are found in Moldenhauer 1979, 253. The Nachlaß also contains Berg’s draft letter to Pella concerning the trip (Berg 480/318), a letter from Konzertbüro Hermann Wolff (Berg 1553), and Berg’s border pass (Berg 428/10).

36 Portions of the German text of the two letters to Schoenberg quoted here can be found in R. Hilmar 1978, 163.


Binder Sheet 2. The advance notice appeared in the Neue Freie Presse (und Gleichlautend Neues Wiener Tagblatt) 14-06-23.


38 This “Korrekturzettel” was with the “Liste der Materials” noted above. Some of the text on the Korrekturzettel: “Bitte womöglich diese Korrekturen (die größtenteils in Stimmen material berücksichtigt vom dürften) in einiger Exemplare der Part. eingetragen. Von einer endgültigen allgemeinen Retoucherung wurde ich heute noch absehen, las die Stücke einmal mit den [?word not deciphered?] Proben u. Orchester aufgesucht worden sind [Das III. Stück, also die Hälfte dieses Opus 6] ist überhaupt noch nicht gespielt.” The second set of square brackets is in the original. The document has an additional page with Berg’s scrawled annotation “Fragebogen beantwortung”.
Information on editorial team members can be found in the centennial exhibition catalogue, R. Hilmar 1985, particularly 160–171; and in R. Hilmar 1983, the *Gutenberg Jahrbuch* article that details the nature of the team's editorial changes in a survey of documents for *Wozzeck*, Act I, Scene 1. Berg's letters to Julius Schloss are compiled in Falschle 1989. Schloss was unable to participate in the posthumous editing of Berg's works because he had to escape the Nazis; he lived in Shanghai from 1939 to 1948 and then emigrated to the United States; see McLean 1987. Piano works by Apostel and Schloß (as well as Steuermann and Hans Jelinek)—including Schloss's Piano Sonata 1929, which incorporates subtle references to the secret program of Berg's *Lyric Suite*—are available in a two-CD set of historical recordings by Montreal pianist Karl Steiner, Centaur Records CRC 2241/42, ©1995; see McLean 1995.

Concerning Reich's copy of the 8-hand piano reduction (A-Wn S.m. 34.206/1). Since it is known that Reich (1898–1980) began his studies with Berg near the end of 1928 (25–10–1928), this reduction must date from Reich's student days, during the time Berg was preparing his revised version of the score. The format of the document is as follows: three gatherings, one for each movement, of 3, 8, and 10 interleaved double sheets, respectively; the pages are numbered from 1–6, 7–22, and 23–42. Reich's address stamp is found on the first and last page of each fascicle. The manuscript paper measures 25 cm x 33 cm and is 12-line. As noted in the brief description in Chapter 3, Reich has conveniently boxed most (though not quite all) of Berg's annotations in blue pencil. The document shows the student's numerous erasures and corrections. Even as an exercise it is clearly incomplete, and although Berg's annotations might shed some light on his teaching practice—they are of decidedly modest value for a study of Opus 6.

See the exchange on *Wozzeck*, 11–01–26 S–B, 21–01–26 B–S (Brand, Hailey, Harris 1987, 342–343). Ten days is a rather lengthy delay for Berg's reply to Schoenberg; perhaps he was not quite as taken with Schoenberg's "kind words" as he pretends.

On the Chamber Concerto, see the "open letter to Schoenberg," 09–02–25 (Brand, Hailey, Harris 1987, 334–337); concerning the secret-programmatic contents of its variations—the first four of which depicted Schoenberg-circle friends Eduard Steuermann, Rudolf Kolisch, Josef Polnauer, and Erwin Stein—see Dalen 1989, 142–145. On the row manipulations in the *Lyric Suite*, see 13–07–26 B–S (Brand, Hailey, Harris 1987, 348–351); Berg's preference for deriving new motives by selecting non-adjacent pitch-classes from a previous segment and for laying motives out in complementary rhythm are to some extent anticipated in Opus 6.

Brand, Hailey, Harris 1987, 398; Schoenberg's *Bekenntnis* is translated in *Style and Idea*, Schoenberg 1975, 475.
Correspondence with Johannes Schüler in the Berg Nachlaß relevant to Opus 6 includes: F 21 Berg 1331/2 (08–04–29) decision to program, 1331/3 (05–05–29) and /4 (18–06–29) further details, 1331/18 (02–02–30) in which Schüler thanks Berg for receipt of the score, and 1331/6 (01–04–30) in which Schüler talks of the rehearsals and adds a postscript request for "a few words for the program booklet": "Ich hatte heute die zweite Orchesterprobe für Ihre Stücke, die mich in höchstem Masse fesseln. ... [P.S. verso] ... "einige Worte für Programmheft." This request came two weeks before the performance, not four as Reich 1963, 107 [Reich 1965, 115] reports.

Excerpt from Nachrichten für die Stadt und Land, Oldenburg (15–04–30):

"Die drei Orchesterstücke, die gestern eine — als Neubearbeitung bedingte — Uraufführung erlebten, sind vor dem "Wozzeck" entstanden, in Farblichkeit wie Struktur keineswegs kühner beziehungsweise moderner geschrieben. Die innere Verwandtschaft geht so weit, daβ es kaum einmal schwer fallen dürfte, hinsichtlich der tonmalerischen Ausdrucksverwertung in manchen Einzelheiten ähnlichen oder gar gleich gearteten Parallelstellen nachzugehen. Immer wieder in der dreiteiligen Folge der Orchestersuite treten Klangwirkungen und Wendungen auf, die geradezu bühnenszenischen Eindrücke, wie sie der "Wozzeck" vermittelt, mit denselben instrumentalen Mitteln heraufbeschwören.

"Nun mag man Alban Berg gegenüber — dies gilt auch für seinen "Wozzeck" — verschiedener Meinung sein. Eins aber sollte allgemein anerkannt und von seiner Seite umstritten werden: es handelt sich hier um eine künstlerische Persönlichkeit, der es — im Gegensatz zu anderen Vertretern der "neuen" Richtung — unbedingt ernst ist mit dem, was sie schafft, und die darum Anspruch darauf erheben darf ernst genommen zu werden.

"Für die Orchesterstücke gilt dies einmal in vollem Umfang in bezug auf den musikalischen Ausdruck, zum anderen aber auch wesentlich, und zwar in nicht geringerem Grade in Hinsicht auf die außerordentlich sorgfältige, in der Wahl der Mittel bedachtsame, einer strengen thematischen Logik folgende kompositorische Architektur. Die drei Sätze, zumal das Präludium, sind nicht etwa spierlerisch hingeschrieben, sondern erarbeitet worden, im symmetrischen Aufbau nicht ohne Gehalt und Größe. Alban Berg ist keiner, der in der Tonsprache hinredet um zu reden — er ist einer der heute wenigen, die auch tatsächlich etwas zu sagen haben.

"Die Aufführung der beiden modernen Stücke durch unser Landesorchester ist höchsten Lobes wert; sie war schließlich angezeigt. Besonders an die Vermittlung von Alban Bergs Orchestersuite hatte Landesmusikdirektor Schüler sich hingeben mit einem — fast möchte man sagen: fanatischen Feuereifer. So kam jede Klangschattierung zu imposanter
Wirkung, wobei im einzelnen das Eingehen der häufig solistisch herangezogenen Holz- und Blechbläser zu rühmen ist, die sich den anspruchsvollen Aufgaben glänzend gewachsen zeigten. In hervorragender Präzision folgten die Streichergruppen Konzertmeister Volkmar Fledens lebendiger Führung. Ein gewaltiges Stück Arbeit ward hier geleistet."

"Immerhin war ein Teil des Publikums nicht mit dieser Musik einverstanden. So setzte dann nach der erfolgreichen Aufführung ein kleines Pfeiffkorset ein. Allerdings wurde die Opposition sofort nidergeklopf durch den zum Orkan anwachsenden Beifall der übergroßen Mehrheit des Haufes. Offenbar wurde hier nicht die Musik kritisiert, sondern der Komponist Berg, der ja auch im Vorjahre schon von bestimmter Seite abgelehnt wurde. Es macht nun keinen guten Eindruck, wenn Leute zu einer Uraufführung schon gleich Trillerflöte und Schlüssel mitbringen. Der Zwischenfall störte im übrigen nicht viel, er veranlaßte nur eine um so stärkere Zustimmung er übergroßen Mehrheit. ... Das Oldenburger Landesorchester, das die ungeheuer schwere Aufgabe der Bergschen Konzertstücke wiederum in bewunderwürdiger Weise meisterte, zeigte bei der Beethovenschen 8. Sinfonie eine Musiezierfreudigkeit, die helles Entzücken auslösen mußte. Die großartige Leitung wurde vom Publikum gebührend anerkannt."

Excerpt from the Oldenburger Volksblatt (16–04–30):

Schiiler vom ersten Takt an, im Hause jenes Fluidum zu erzeugen, das man bei außergewöhnlichen Ereignissen kennt. Daß die Intensität des Eindrucks neben stürmischer Anerkennung für den Komponisten und die Interpreten auch heftiger Ablehnung (mit Zischen, Trillerpfeife und 'Schlagwerk') hinweis, kann nur also positiver Faktor für Werk und Ausführung gewertet werden.”

Excerpt from the Weser Zeitung of Bremen (19-04-30):


Excerpt from the Berlin newspaper Germania (05-04-30):


See Reich 1963, 53-54 [Reich 1965, 57] on Scherchen and the Wozzeck Bruchstücke, first performed 15-06-24 under Scherchen in Frankfurt. In examining Nachlass correspondence between Berg and Scherchen, it is important to establish which “Drei Stücke” are being referred to in any given instance: the Wozzeck excerpts, the Lyric Suite movements, or Opus 6. F 21 Berg 1298/18 (26-05-24) refers to “3 Orchesterstücke” but, given the date, could easily be a reference to the Wozzeck excerpts. Item 1298/41 (27-10-31;
though stamped 11-09-31) states Scherchen’s intentions to perform the Opus 6 pieces in Winterthur and to record the Wozzeck excerpts in Berlin. The Winterthur concert season would merit separate study. The General-Program in Berg’s binder (A-Wn F 21 Berg 3135, sheet 7) consists of two double-folios stapled in the centre: there were fourteen regular subscription concerts, five popular concerts, one youth concert, four “Studien-Aufführung”, and two “Extra-Konzerte.” Scherchen conducted many of the concerts himself, though Stravinsky, for example, was guest conductor for music from his Apollon Musagète and Le Baiser de la Fée (21-01-31). The “Studien-Aufführungen” programs were almost exclusively devoted to contemporary works. Berg’s three movements for string orchestra arranged from the Lyric Suite were performed in the second “Studienauführung” (02-11-30) of the previous Winterthur season. Judging from the report on Opus 6 given in the next note, below, the “Studienaufführungen” were addressed to the audience segment interested in contemporary works and the pieces programmed were probably insufficiently rehearsed for inclusion in the regular subscription program.

4Schweizerische Musikzeitung 21 (1931) 760, on Opus 6: “Denn Werke, wie beispielsweise die thematisch konzentrierten, rhythmisch und klanglich so schwer faßbaren, unsinnlich fantastisch instrumentierten ‘Drei Orchesterstücke’ von Alban Berg, die nicht nur technische, sondern mehr noch restlose geistige Vertrautheit mit der Materie zu Voraussetzung haben, würden schließlich eine derart hohe Zahl von Proben benötigen, daß sie die für Studienaufführungen zur Verfügung stehenden Vorbereitungsfristen um ein Vielfaches übersteigen dürften. Warum aber soll, um zum bestmöglichen Resultat zu kommen, eine solche Arbeit nicht über den ganzen Winter verteilt werden? Diese ‘Wozzeck’-Vorstudien müssen erdauert werden. Dann aber verlieren sie alles Problematische, erschließen sich uns mit ihrer vollen, ungeheueren Spannungsin tensität, können erfühlt und verstanden werden.”

5Gathering detailed information on the historical instruments and instrumentation practices of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries remains a difficult task and it would certainly be a topic worthy of scholarly inquiry, particularly so now that our interest in authentic performance practices for “early music” has extended well into the Romantic period. Two of the most useful resources for contemporary information on instrumentation are: Forsyth 1935 [Orchestration, first edition 1914], and Schenker 1908 (the Instrumenten-Tabelle published by Universal Edition under Schenker’s pseudonym, Artur Niloff).

5:A-Wn F 21 Berg 141: “Kopist: Die Altposaunen=Stimme ist im Tenorschlüssel / zu kopieren [handdrawn tenor clef] bzw. [handdrawn bass clef] / (Der Altschlüssel verschwimmet also) / [in der Part. bleibt der Alt-
Stravinsky (1959, 30) also laments the lack of good alto trombone players, citing his *Threni* and Berg's *Altenberglieder* (fourth song) as other pieces that could profit from skilled players. Apostel's alternative editorial suggestion—that a "trumpet in low E-flat" be considered for the high trombone passages—does not originate with Berg; by present-day standards, it is, in any case, an obsolete and less-effective solution to the use of an alto trombone.

The seven-pedal Erard double-action orchestral harp (rather than, for example, the chromatically-strung Pleyel harp) is certainly intended in Berg's score, since the composer calls for glissandi in several places. The awkwardness of Berg's harp writing is apparent as early as m.6 of the *Präludium*, where the shifts back and forth between B-flat and B-natural and F-harp and F-natural are challenging enough when split between two players: to be sure, the first of these could be finessed by substituting a C-flat pedal setting for B-natural; but the second is unavoidable, since G is in use at the same time. Berg's notation (and Jelinek's as well) regularly fails to specify pedal settings, to take enharmonic settings into account, or to redistribute notes between the two players in a manner that takes advantage of the pedal-setting options afforded by two instruments; e.g., *Reigen*, m.9f G#/Ab?, m.16 diminished seventh glissandi, m.48 whole-tone glissando, m.107f. Ab/G#, etc. These observations do not gainsay the effectiveness of Berg's harp writing in many passages; e.g., *Präludium*, mm.42, 48, 50ff, *Reigen*, mm.16ff, 42ff. *Marsch*, mm.142, 155ff, 161ff.

Harpist Franz Jelinek was Professor at the Akademie für Musik und darstellende Kunst through 1945; information obtained from Gerhard Rill, Österreichisches Staatsarchiv.

Examples of below-range errors include: clarinet (*Marsch*, m.29, C3, highly unlikely on A clarinet), bassoon 3 (*Reigen*, m.42, A2), trumpet (*Marsch*, m.66, G3, though perhaps possible, cf. Bruckner's Seventh Symphony, i, m.235, trumpets 2 and 3), and xylophone (*Präludium*, m.37 continues into lower octave in 1923 edition, corrected by Apostel; however, nowadays the instrument often does go down to C3).

The entries in the Cary collection document are not in Berg's hand; the careful printing style is probably Jokl's hand. There are a few additional performance-related scrawls: e.g., p.15 "Kontr-Baß solo" *Präludium* m.49; p.19 phrase-grouping slurs near the beginning of *Reigen*; p.53 *Marsch* m.29 third clarinet part at low E-flat, entry in pencil, "es gibt es nicht!". It is not clear whose entries these are. The Jazz-mutes entry reads: "An vielen Stellen des gedämpften Blechs hat sich die Verwendung von *Jazz dämpfern* [underlining in red pencil] besonders bewährt." This remark is also found in the
Druckvorlage document housed at the offices of Universal Edition, though neither it nor the acknowledgement of Jelinek's rearrangement of the harp parts appear in the published scores.


This memorandum perhaps explains why several notes and accidentals in the currently available offset-print study and full scores are less than completely legible.

"Das Publikum war sich offensichtlich nicht bewusst, daß der letzte Takt bereits verklungen war und harrte in Stillschweigen. Erst als sich Prof. Sawallisch vor dem Orchester verneigte, setzte zögernder Beifall ein."

The performance duration estimates given in the score (as shown in Figure 6.2, above) are uniformly short by approximately one minute for each movement, three minutes for the total: in comparison, Claudio Abbado's classic 1971 recording with the London Symphony Orchestra has durations of 4'56, 5'48, and 9'48 for the individual movements and a total recorded playing time of 20'38; Abbado's 1995 recording with the Vienna Philharmonic is slightly faster throughout, with durations of 4'45, 5'31, and 9'29 for the individual movements and a total recorded playing time of 19'45.
7 Marsch eines Asthmatikers:
a documentary and analytical study

Berg’s Marsch can be an extremely frustrating item from both documentary and analytical perspectives. On the documentary side, the frustrations are caused by the nearly illegible sketches, the dishevelled appearance of the Particell, and by the enticing overlaps with both Wozzeck and the Symphonic-Fragment. There are more extant sketches for the Marsch than there are for the Präludium and Reigen combined. These sketches include the most detailed for all of Opus 6 (particularly Berg 13 ii., pp.14–15), as well as several fascinating sketches for leading thematic ideas. But the majority of sketches provide only rhythmic contours; moreover, the few pitches that are present regularly fail to correspond to those in Particell and score.

The Particell (a general description was provided in Chapter 3) has numerous erasures, insertions, and overtracings. It is sometimes a model of clarity in those very passages which we might expect to be convoluted (e.g., mm.84–91 or m.136ff.); on the other hand, it shows messy evidence of Berg’s second thoughts in passages that would not in themselves appear overly complex (e.g., mm.25–38). In general, the Particell provides great insight into the ranking and organization of thematic elements. The piece is, after all, quite dense in texture and the opportunity to view it in Berg’s short-score conception brings great aural and analytical advantages.
Then there are the puzzling connections to Wozzeck and the Symphonic-Fragment. A passage in the Marsch (mm.79–83) is often described as “the Wozzeck quotation,” since it is largely a reorchestration of the “hallucination motive” found in Act I, scene 2 of the opera (mm.274–278). Of course, the passage is described this way because the opera is the more familiar work; if it really were such a quotation, it would be an anachronism, since the short score of the opera was not completed until October of 1921 (Reich 1963, 52; trans. 1965, 55). The passage, as we shall see, does not appear in final form in Berg’s sketchbook (13/ii), but one of its preliminary versions comes exactly at the point (p.49) where the Marsch sketches stop and the Wozzeck sketches begin. Moreover, there are no known sketches for the passage amongst those for Wozzeck (see the inventory in Fanning 1987, 312), though highly tentative sketches for earlier ideas in the same scene (1/2) can be found in the Marsch sketchbook (p.90). To complicate things further, the same passage—as it occurs in Berg’s Particell and as it appears in the Wozzeck short score—reveals a number of similarities to the beginning of the published Symphonic-Fragment. (This relation was noted in Chapter 2 and will be briefly supplemented with an example in the present chapter.) In addition, the principal thematic ideas of the remainder of the Fragment are constructed from the same trichordal cells (specifically 014 and 016) that characterize so many of the initial ideas in Opus 6 (specifically, for the Marsch, at mm.1, 2, 5, 9 bass, and 11).

These documentary complexities pale, however, in comparison with the broadly-recognized roadblocks to analysis. The Marsch presents formidable analytical challenges, challenges that begin with its performing or listening experience. As Pierre Boulez has expressed it in the liner notes to his early recording of the Chamber Concerto, Altenberglieder and Opus 6
The Three Pieces for Orchestra, Op.6, form a great contrast to the Lieder, Op.4. The outstanding feature of the orchestral writing in Op. 4 is its transparency. The accent in Op. 6 is placed on density, which, moreover, makes its performance fairly difficult[1]. Its writing and manner of orchestration mark an irrepressible tendency towards complexity; the sonorous density reaches a point of saturation by the accumulation of real parts and the superimposition of all categories of timbre. It is therefore not an illusory density but rather an entirely concrete thickness.

Boulez’s references to density, complexity, saturation, accumulation, and superimposition constitute a litany of difficulties rather like those detailed by Berg himself in “Why is Schoenberg’s music so difficult to understand?”; namely: multiplicity in harmony, multi-level definition of cadence, unsymmetrical construction of themes, variation of theme and harmony, polyphony extending over the whole work, inimitable contrapuntal technique, diversity and differentiation of rhythms. (Article originally in Anbruch (1924); reprinted in Reich 1963, 191; trans. Reich 1965, 202: the ‘litany’ given here is almost directly quoted from Berg).

Boulez (ibid.) goes on to christen the Marsch, amongst the Opus 6 pieces as:

the most “immoderate,” as much by the maximum volume it attains as by the grand dramatic gesture which characterizes it. In it can be sensed an almost demented intoxication [with] the dramatic gesture, a hysteria, I would say, in declamation swelled to unbearable din.

So there we have it: density, dementia, and din.

The density is obviously due to the quantity of material competing for our attention, the multiplicity of parts, the information overload posed by
streams of complex chords, the sensory bombardment of timbral overlay. The dementia, or apparent hysteria, manifest in the work is a quality more difficult to evaluate, though it surely stems from the combination of textural density and relentless forward drive; and from the formal dyspepsia at the phrase-thematic level. The dementia has larger cultural implications. It is not merely an instance of expressionist extremism, not the individual psychological warpèdness embodied in Schoenberg’s Pierrot Lunaire and Erwartung. Rather, the dementia stems from the continual disruption of entirely familiar elements: march rhythms, textures built from the repetition of motives, thematic ideas that begin from a pretense of conventional presentation, and moments of quasi-tonal arrival.

The tearing asunder of these stabilizing conventions results in a far more foreboding analog to the broader cultural situation of the time—the outbreak of World War I and the subsequent collapse of the Austro-Hungarian empire—than any musical simulation of personal hysteria could accomplish. As George Perle has pointed out, “the emotional climate of Berg’s pre-war ‘marche macabre’ is very similar to that of Ravel’s post-war ‘valse macabre’ (Perle 1980, 18).” To be sure, one might try to locate a more personal level of hysteria in Berg’s psychological state in 1914–15 (as documented in Chapter 2); though his collapse (in 1915) was due to nervous and physical exhaustion, less cause than result of his intense work on the Marsch, his tense relations with Schoenberg, and the debilitating demands of his military induction.

The piece certainly is “immoderate,” as Boulez puts it, in its textural overindulgence, but the programmatic aspects of its “dementia” encapsulate a Euro-cultural rather than a personal condition. Moreover, on the personal level, the dementia is not intended as a representation of a psychological.
trauma but, rather, of a *physical* one. Berg explained his programmatic intentions in a letter to Schoenberg [Good Friday 1914 (04-10-1914)]:

As of three days now I have finally been able to work, the plan for a fairly large movement, representing a march, is finished, as are a number of sections; unfortunately my wife is ailing again. ... With the coming of spring, my asthma, too, has reappeared. Sufficient prerequisites, as you see, for at last writing something cheerful. Maybe for once it will work in reverse!: If what I write doesn't represent what I have experienced, then perhaps my life will for once conform to my compositions, which would in that case be purest prophecy. But I think I lack that power as I lack so many others, and even if I'm absolutely determined for once to avoid "the tears" it will probably not be the march of an upright person marching cheerfully, but rather at best—in which case it would at least be a "character piece"—the "March of an Asthmatic," which I am and, it seems, will remain forever.—

Berg's comments are, of course, slathered with his usual hang-dog tone of self-deprecation before Schoenberg, but there is no mistaking his ironic conceptualization for the *Marsch eines Astmatikers*. And we shall see that the formal interjections (at the thematic level) and interpolations (at the sectional level), as well as the invasions of conventional voice-leading and quasi-tonal cadential function, give the surface of the *Marsch* (particularly in its second half, m.91ff) a considerably more chaotic appearance than its large-scale organization might predict. The result is a kind of "form-functional asthma" and it shows how Berg realized his *Marsch eines Astmatikers* in ways that go well beyond the off-beat wheezings of the opening rhythms.

And now, the din. The first textural build-ups (mm.1-14 and 15-24) merely hint at things to come. The transition expands the content through greater density of information (in the chordal stream of m.25ff) rather than through increase in timbre, texture and volume (which would be a more conventional approach). Some of the later din results from the layering of thematic ideas (often with collateral thickening) in stretti and canon (e.g., the texture takeover leading to m.76, the canons of mm.111-120). The second
half of the Marsch has several textural builds (mm.102–107, 115–120, 121–126) leading to the great racket of the Höhepunkt (m.126) and the follow-up chordal commotion (m.136ff) that ends with walloping hammer and timpani blows (m.142f). The biggest psychological moment, however, is still to come: though not overly dense, the fanfare passage led by horns, trumpets and trombones (mm.149–155) effects a combination of motivic obstinacy and wildness that is coupled with a powerful quasi-tonal arrival (on D2, m.155) and a serious violation of Richard Strauss’s caveat for young conductors to “never look encouragingly at the brass (1974, 38).”

While such density, dementia, and din is evidently overwhelming to performers and listeners, it does not tell the whole story of the challenges for analysts. The immensity of Berg’s formal conception is complemented by such a freedom of thematic development and looseness of motivic manipulation—or at least the appearance of such looseness when viewed through the lense of pitch-class set theory—that the methodological tools at our disposal seem inadequate. Though motivic snippets return, thematic recurrence is often subject to miniscule and ostensibly arbitrary changes of detail, and recapitulation is regularly replaced by the combinative transformation of ideas. Even apparent similarities of contour tend to evaporate on closer examination. And since contemporary music theorists prefer analytical precision—particularly precision with respect to pitch details—the Opus 6 pieces (and the Marsch above all) generally force us into retreat, with heads shaking.

Into this head-shaking coterie comes Mark DeVoto (1984), to whom we must give the nod for solving most of the nettlesome taxonomic difficulties of the Marsch’s thematic structure. It is surely testimony to the analytical complexities of the piece that DeVoto’s sixty-six page article on the work—with a publication date seventy years after the time of Berg’s composition—
appears in the journal *Perspectives of New Music*. Almost a third of DeVoto’s article is given to the presentation on facing pages of a “Table of Themes” and a “Chronology of Events”; that is, to a ‘program note’ or ‘listening guide’, albeit in the finest tradition of such exegesis.

The analytical and documentary tasks of this chapter are greatly facilitated by adopting DeVoto’s table of 31 themes, which we will shortly reproduce. First, however, it is important to acquire a general overview of the form of the *Marsch*. This is shown in Figure 7.1:

**Figure 7.1: General Overview of the Form of the Marsch**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Min.</th>
<th>General Descriptions of the major formal subdivisions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Defining formal moments ...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Indent: descriptions of further subdivisions</em> ...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-14</td>
<td>expository: march tempo, gradual textural buildup, string tune</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-24</td>
<td>second run at textural buildup, English horn tune</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-28</td>
<td>transitional?: chordal-rhythmic texture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29-32</td>
<td>thematic interpolation (solo viola) and gradual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33-38</td>
<td>theme ticizing of chordal-rhythmic material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39-46</td>
<td>episode or middle section?: slower tempo (Eb clarinet)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47-52</td>
<td>middle section proper?: soon finding way back to ...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53-e1</td>
<td>re-establishment march tempo (horn warbles)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62-e5</td>
<td>lighter interlude (grazioso; oboe, clarinet)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66-71</td>
<td>big tune (violins, trumpets)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72-75</td>
<td>texture takeover (timpani, horns, strettis) ...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76-83</td>
<td>takeover complete (tutti), then descent (horns, strings)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84-90</td>
<td>(re)transition, accelerando of layered ostinati to ...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91-98</td>
<td>breakout: new strongly energetic tempo and tune (trumpets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99-106</td>
<td>breath, continuation (violins)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107-120</td>
<td>relentless (<em>martellato</em>) rhythm, canonic thematic presentations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121-126</td>
<td>motivic disintegration, but textural maximization, climax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127-135</td>
<td>catharsis broken by tempo fluctuations, thematic fragmentations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136-143</td>
<td>bariolage (to D) followed by chordal flux</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143-148</td>
<td>misted parenthetic recollection of big tune, grazioso, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149-154</td>
<td>cataclysmic fanfare drives to quasi-tonal arrival (on D2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155-161</td>
<td>coda: slow swelling of thematic ideas and fateful flashback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162-170</td>
<td>dissolution to ticking (D), fogged-out thematic fragments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171-174</td>
<td>final fanfare: disastrous interjection, high swarming and drop</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 7.1 lays out the broad subdivisions of the form. Though measure numbers are necessarily provided to orient the reader, the Figure is intended as a representation of the initial listening experience that could be had without reference to the score. The Figure is best read through twice: first for the general descriptions of the major defining formal moments; second—this time including the indented rows—for the descriptions of their further subdivisions.

Figure 7.1, naturally, follows a course similar to DeVoto’s “Chronology of Events” (1984, odd-numbered pages 391–407) and shamelessly borrows several of his descriptive epithets. However, my Figure is intentionally more succinct, general, and top-down in its orientation. An alternative, more narrative presentation of Figure 7.1 is outlined over the next four paragraphs.

The exposition of ideas in textural buildup (mm.1–14) is followed by a second run (counter-exposition, mm.15–21) that includes the English horn tune (‘alpha’, m.20ff). The change to chordal-rhythmic texture is felt transitional (m.25ff) and the section in slower tempo which follows (Eb clarinet tune, m.39ff) is either a closing episode or the beginning of a contrasting middle section.

The true middle section now seems to follow (m.46ff), but soon finds its way back to the march tempo, and—via the horn warbles (m.53ff), a grazioso interlude (m.62ff), and a big tune (m.66ff)—culminates in the striking takeover of the texture by one rhythmic idea (m.72ff, strettini in timpani and horns). Following its dénouement (the descent in horns and strings, m.78ff), an expectation of retransition ensues in a two-stage crescendoing texture of layered ostinati (m.79ff, m.84ff).

All sense of the relative orderliness of the preceding disappears from memory with the breakout of the energetic section that initiates the second half of the piece (m.91ff). This new and faster material governs the forward
momentum—in two runs (m.91ff and m.107ff)—leading to the textural climax (Höhepunkt, m.126). The catharsis which follows, however, is quickly replaced by a renewed forward drive caused by tempo fluctuations and thematic fragmentations. A bariolage to D is followed by chordal flux (m.136) and misted (also simultaneous) parenthetic recapitulations of the grazioso idea, the big tune, and other motives (mm.143–148). This is interrupted by a third run at the idea which began the second half, this time in a cataclysmic fanfare (mm.149–155) that drives to a powerful quasi-tonal cadence (to pedaltone D1 and D2, undermined by harp B0 and B1).

We now feel that we are really in coda: after a slow swelling of cyclic-thematic ideas (‘alpha’ and ‘beta’), a fateful “flashback” (to the Präludium; mm.11–13) dissolves in voice-leading convergence to a single ticking note (D4), against which we hear fogged-out thematic fragments. The tension does not fully abate, however, and a final fanfare disastrously interjects and culminates in a high swarming (about Bb5 and Bb6) which is brusquely cut off in a plummet to the abyss (low E1 and E2).

Now many analysts would likely agree that a listener who got this much structure out of the piece on a few hearings would be doing well indeed. Yet the process I have hypothesized focuses on coming to grips with broad distinctions in the formal role of passages rather than on the identification of thematic variants, or on the determination of their precise motivic content. Such an overview, in either the chart or the narrative layouts given above, seems to me prerequisite to more refined analytical understanding. With such a formal overview obtained, we are now ready to proceed with the discrimination of thematic content.

Figure 7.2 (in oblong format on the next three pages) reproduces the musical examples in DeVoto’s “Table of Themes” (1984, even-numbered pages 390–406).
Figure 7.2: DeVoto's "Table of Themes" (p.1 of 3)
Figure 7.2 (cont'd): DeVoto's "Table of Themes" (p.2 of 3)
Figure 7.2 [cont'd]: DeVoto's "Table of Themes" (p.3 of 3)
As DeVoto has said, these "themes"—in length, pitch content, and character—are "as various as they are abundant." And he acknowledges that "it is often hard to decide, on the basis of any criteria other than first appearance, whether or not a given melody is more validly characterized by a collateral part, by a collateral harmony, by association with or dissociation from other melodies that occur in succession with it, or by the degree to which subsequent transformation (including fragmentations) are or are not independently used." The difficulty is compounded by the thematic manipulations that occur: "fragmentation and recombination, transformation of one theme into another, use of one or more themes as the characterizing feature of an episode, contrapuntal elaboration of one theme, and contrapuntal combination of several themes (1984, p.408)."

One could—as DeVoto himself intimates—choose to quibble with his selections, reducing his total of 31 themes by rejecting some as continuations, or variants of others. For example, bass idea VII might be understood as a mere counterpoint to VI, a development of I, and a way of anticipating leading idea VIII. In support of such a view, we note that idea VII does not recur (though the sketches will show Berg expected it would). Similarly, the fact that the sole recollections of brief ideas XVI (m.52) and XVII (m.54f) are decidedly buried in their surrounding textures (at mm.139 and 147, respectively) might suggest that they are perhaps better understood as mere continuations of preceding material. And idea XXXI, as DeVoto shows, is, after all, but a fragmentation of the delta-2 tag that precedes it. Quibbling in the other direction—adding to the 31 themes—may appear a more frightening prospect, but it is also possible. For example, though DeVoto's table includes the three variant forms of episode idea XV (Eb clarinet in mm.39, 41, and 44), it does not include the variant complementary ideas which follow (in mm.40, 42 and 43, also Eb clarinet). Similarly, the horn idea
at m.99 and the violin idea in m.122 (the latter derived from XXIX) have self-sufficient qualities that are not accounted for in DeVoto’s Table. As a final instance, we note that the ‘Wozzeck quotation’, though cited in DeVoto’s Chronology, does not appear as an independent thematic idea in his Table, though—except for its delta-derived tail—it surely is one.

It is, however, not my purpose to quibble with DeVoto’s choices, since his thematic designations are generally accurate, more than sufficient, and highly useful as identifiers. Rather, the preceding cautionary critique serves to underscore DeVoto’s own observation that Berg seems to be engaged in a “conscious principle” of “thematic nonstandardization (p.408)”; a use of developing variation that results in what DeVoto defines as “a negative principle of variation,” where “transformation of a thematic element can be applied to an extent that not only the original form, but the variational algorithm as well, can no longer be perceived or comprehended (p.409).” Though this last comment perhaps slightly overstates the difficulties we face in articulating many of the thematic interrelations in the Marsch, it does finger the central problem that the piece poses to our analytical methods whose chief goal is normally the assertion of some precisely definable motivic similarity between disjunct thematic statements.

Even if we manage to surmount these theme-identifying difficulties, we are still faced with the ‘diachronic dilemma’: the problem of describing the rationale for why one idea follows another, or why any idea develops the way it does. One way to handle this situation would be to trace the development of thematic ideas independently. DeVoto does this, for example, in his neat look at “the later adventures of II (1984, 412–419).” Of course, such an approach—were it relentlessly pursued—would eventually show how the piece ‘hangs separately’ rather than how it hangs together. And a serious attempt at a multivariate approach along phenomenological
lines would surely result in the "interminable analysis" to which Dominique Jameux (1975) only alludes in addressing the considerably more compact Präludium. Since we have so many other aspects of the Marsch to consider—in both documentary and analytical terms—it would clearly be preferable to construct a more concise resource that would allow readers to pursue the "later history" of any given idea without the burden of narration. Figure 7.3 provides such a resource. It lays out DeVoto's 31 themes along the horizontal axis and runs through the 174 measures of the Marsch on the vertical axis. This permits readers to track the recurrence and development of any given thematic idea by reading down its column. (For reasons of space DeVoto's roman-numeral identifiers are replaced with arabic numerals. It will be recalled that alpha [α], beta [β], and delta—the last in both its downward [δ₁] and upward [δ₂] configurations—are cyclic; they are also found in the Präludium and in Reigen.) Figure 7.3, a "Measure run through the Marsch showing instances of DeVoto's 31 themes," follows over the next seven pages.

The Legend at the right of the first page of Figure 7.3 tabulates the symbols used to show the various things that happen to a motive as it proceeds: repetition (the motive number is repeated), continuance of the same idea into the next measure(s) (↑) [i.e., the motive is inherently more than a measure in length], developmental continuation (/), imitative or collateral additions (+), transformative development (↓), or liquidation (→). The chart also shows when one idea yields to, is transformed into, or is taken over by another. For example, idea 7 (m.9–10) leads directly to theme 8 (m.11) and the liquidation of theme 8 (m.14) passes into the return of motive 3 (m.15). In keeping with my form-functional distinctions (recall Chapter 1) concerning the relative dimensions of musical units, I will refer to single-measure or smaller fragments listed in DeVoto's table as 'motives', two-measure units as 'ideas', and longer passages as 'themes'.
Figure 7.3. Measure run through the Marsch showing instances of DeVoto's 31 themes (page 1 of 7)

DeVoto's 31 numbered themes →

m#  1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8  α  9,  9,  10 11 12 13 14 15 15,  δ  16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 23, 24,  β  25 26 27 24, 24, 28 29 24, 30 31
001  1
002  1 2
003  1 2 3
004  1 2 3 4
005  1 3 4 5
006  / + / 4 | δ
007  / / / /  1
008  / / / /  6
009  7 ↓ / /  1 7
010  / ↓ /  ↓ 1
011  / / tail/ 88
012  / 3 4  2 | 1
013  / / ~  1
014  δ ~ δ  tag ~
015  3 4  ~  3
016  3 4
017  2 3 4
018  / 3 4
019 (1) ↓ / /
020 (α) ~ 3 4  α
021 ~ 3 4  |
022 ~ 3 4  /
023 cad ~ 5  cad
024  1  9

A. Exposition: "Aa" in sketches
Mäßiges Marschtempo (I)
rhythmic block + "Melodie" V, δ, VI, VIII
idea VI is marked "Ab"

Legend: [see text for further details]
| l = same idea ...
| / = continuation of motive
| + = imitative or collateral additions
| ↓ = transformatiave development
| ~ = liquidation of motive

Counter-exposition:
rhythmic block + α melody ...
to cadential idea (m.23);
V structurally framing.
IX terminating

(idea at m.20 marked "b" in sketches)
Figure 7.3 continued, page 2 of 7:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>m#</th>
<th>1 2 3 4 5 δ₂ 6 7 8 α 9, 9₂ 10 11 12 13 14 15, 15, δ₁ 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23, 23₂ 24, β 25 26 27 24₂ 24, 28 29 24, 30 31</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>025</td>
<td>10 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>026</td>
<td>9₁ 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>027</td>
<td>5 (2) 9, 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>028</td>
<td>/ 5 11 11 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>029</td>
<td>/ 8 9₁ 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>030</td>
<td>5 + (2) 9₂</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>031</td>
<td>/ / 5 10 10 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>032</td>
<td>/ 9₂ 9₂ /</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>033 (α)</td>
<td>/ α 10 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>034</td>
<td>/ / 9₂ 11 11 (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>035</td>
<td>/ α 10 10 / (α)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>036 (1)</td>
<td>α 11 /</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>037</td>
<td>cad 11 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>038</td>
<td>/ ~ 14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Transition part 1, chordal-rhythmic:**

- X leads, XI terminates

**Transition part 2, thematic:**

- XII and XIII(cf.VIII/alpha) lead;

**Transition part 3, combination:**

- Flottes Marschtempo (II) (possibly C1)
  - lead shifts to IX₂-X-XI,
  - ("thematicizing" of Transition part 1)
  - alpha accompanying, XIV terminating

"Episode": (possibly section C2, if not B)

- Viel langsamer, sehr zögern
  - XV leads, XII complements,
  - delta motives terminate

C. Middle Section ("C3" in sketches)

- IX against delta tag

(Tempo I recovered by this point)
Figure 7.3 continued, page 3 of 7:

| m#   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | α | 9 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 15 | δ | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 23 | 24 | β | 25 | 26 | 27 | 28 | 24 | 29 | 30 | 31 |
| 053  | 2| 3| 9| 2| 17| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /|
| 054  | 17| /| tail=| 11| rh| 17| II→XVII| leads ("C4" in sketches),| XVII/XIX| interjects;| subsection| terminates| with| imitative| flurry| of| XIX| against| III| rhythm| in| heavy| chords|
| 055  | /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /|
| 056  | /| /| /| [014]| /| /| [012]| /| 18| XVIII/XIX| interjects;| subsection| terminates| with| imitative| flurry| of| XIX| against| III| rhythm| in| heavy| chords|
| 057  | /| /| /| /| 9| 2| 19| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /|
| 059  | /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /|
| 060  | 3| chords| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /|
| 061  | /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /|
| 062  | ↓| 8| (20)| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /|
| 063  | /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /|
| 064  | /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /|
| 065  | /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /|
| 066  | [21]| 13| 13| 18| /| /| 21| "big tune"| XXI| [derived| from| III];| XIII/II| and| XVIII| counterpoint,| (XIX)/XX| continue(s)| in| fragments|
| 067  | 2| 2| 2| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /|
| 068  | 1| 13| 18| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /|
| 069  | 2| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /|
| 070  | (1)| 2| tr−| 2| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /|
| 071  | /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /|
| 072  | /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /|
| 073  | 11| 13| 13| stretto| /| /| 13| D. XIII| strett"takeover"|
| 074  | 13| 13| 13| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /|
| 075  | 13| 13| 13| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /|
| 076  | 9| 2| 2| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /| /|

---

C. continues Flottes Marschtempo (II)

---

"big tune" XXI [derived from III]; XIII/II and XVIII counterpoint, (XIX)/XX continue(s) in fragments

---

D. XIII strett"takeover"

---

Utnewe breiter tutti takeover by XIII

climax followed by chordal descent to "settling tones" A–G
Figure 7.3 continued, page 4 of 7:

m#  1 2 3 4 5  δ₂  6 7 8  α  9 9 10 11 12 13 14 15  δ₁  16 17 18 19 20 21 22  23 23 24  β  25 26 27 24  24 28 29 24  30 31
079  ~  ↓  (cf. Wozzeck 1/2 274–279)
080  δ₂  /  E. Transition (feels like retransition):
081  /  → cresc.-accel., part 1
082  /  →
083  /
084  6 + augmentation in bass
085  6 layered sequential ostinato of motive
086  6 with grace-note anticipations of
cresc.-accel., part 2
087  6 stretto entries
088  4 6
089  4 6
090  4(5 δ₂)6  second half of piece begins …
091 (1+2)(23,)
092  Allegro energico (III)  [δ₁→]
093  return of march character invokes quality of
cresc. 1
094  recapitulation [delta pedigree suggested],
095  24, 23, 24, β
096  but piece has transformed:
097  XXIII-thru-XXVI form a thematic group;
098  23, β
099  / (cr 24,) β  26
100  breath, followed by developmental continuation;
101  incremental incursions of "creeping" (cr)
102  as section proceeds
103  / cr 1
104  25 27 24, cr
105  / cr 1
106  4 24, cr
Figure 7.3 continued, page 5 of 7:

m # 12345 δ678α9, 9, 101112131415, 15, δ1617181920212223, 23, 24, β25262728293031
107 (28)(23,) continuation of Allegro: 23, 23, + 28 martellato
108 a second run, combining XXIII's 1/ 1/ / 1
109 (23,) against insistent martellato (8) / / 1
110 ( / ) chords (XXVIII); bass F# / 24, / 1
111 (1) (4) (29) over F pedal (rhythm of I, IV, XXVIII) to F pedal 29+canon
112 canonic recollections of Reigen (m.37, 83) rh 28 1
113 in XXIX (becoming XXIV,) and of / / 1
114 (1)[014] XXIII and VIII; again with incremental / / +canon
115 24, creeping (cr) as the section proceeds ... 23, (canon a3) 24, 24, 24, cr 30 cr
116 / / 1
117 8 (canon a3) / / 24, 1
118 / / 24, 1
119 / / 1
120 30 / 1
121 creeping conventions take over (XXX) (23,) 30
122 culminating in numerous strettis; 30 (29) 30
123 2 texture incorporates creeping values of 25 2 stretti
124 / XXV, XXVII, II, and a framing statement down / 27 5 1
125 / 5 of V leading to the climax ... to 5 / 1
126 (3) / δ, (held notes) Höhepunkt [hammer blow #1] C# 1
127 / (canonic) delta portends closure (cf. Prälidium, m.49;
128 / Reigen, mm.102, 115)
129 / δ, tag delta tags accompanied by blocks 30
130 / of scalar creeping (30) in 30
131 / complementary rhythms yield to 30
132 / 6 fragment fragment of VI, then to alpha and / 1
133 / α 13 XIII (solo timp.) leading to ... D bariolage #1
134 + / 1
135 /
**Figure 7.3 continued, page 6 of 7:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>m#</th>
<th>1 2 3 4 5 δ2 6 7 8 α 9,9,10 11 12 13 14 15,15,δ1 Δ1 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23,23,24,β 25 26 27 24,24,28 29 31</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td>2 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>16 11+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>/ 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td>α 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>(5) (10 11) ~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
<td>/ / ~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144</td>
<td>(10) 15, 20 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145</td>
<td>2 15, 20 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146</td>
<td>/ 1 1 20 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147</td>
<td>/ 22 15, 20 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
<td>20 (30) 23, 23, 21, 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149</td>
<td>23, 4+field drum (30) [δ_] = 23,23,23, Fanfare marziale (30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>4+field drum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151</td>
<td>4+field drum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152</td>
<td>/ cr XXIII incipit reveals delta (30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153</td>
<td>↓ over sustained bass into (~)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154</td>
<td>/ extended &quot;V-I cadence to . . . (~)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
<td>3 ↓ Coda: III(rh) in harp ;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156</td>
<td>/ / IV, alpha, beta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157</td>
<td>/ 4 emerge gradually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>158</td>
<td>/ α in additive fashion;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159</td>
<td>/ then flashback interjects . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160</td>
<td>~ 5 (flashback) (form of V from Präludium, mm.11–13)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Flottes Zeitmaß (II)*

Sweeping chordal flux recalling harmonies of mm.25–28 and leading to...

D bariolage #2 against m.37 chords and again recalling m.25, to

D timpani+[hammer blow #2]

Parenthetic thematic recapitulation XXI leads, with XX, XV, and II against 'weird' chords

extended "V-I cadence to . . . (~)"
Figure 7.3 continued, page 7 of 7:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>m#</th>
<th>1 2 3 4 5 δ2 6 7 8 α 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 β 25 26 27 24 24 28 29 30 31</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>162</td>
<td>δ2 (canon a3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>165</td>
<td>31 (tag)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169</td>
<td>'2'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 171 | [δ1 =] 18 | Final fanfare: XVIII also reveals delta |
| 172 | 4 | ↓ pedigree; ic1 and ic2 overlaps swarm |
| 173 | 30 | to Bb5; with plummet to E2 on last 30 31 |
| 174 | [8] | sixty-fourth note + [hammer blow #3] ↓ |
I have used the leftover space at the right of page 1 of Figure 7.3 (p.339) to label the formal subdivisions and to provide a brief description of the chief features of their contents. Thus, mm 1-14 constitute an Exposition, section A, which we will see is designated "Aa" in Berg's sketches. The section establishes the Müßiges Marschtempo (Tempo I) in a textural block that is built up from motives 1 through 4. Above this, the "Melodie" (so described in the sketches) occurs: it is built from the chaining together of ideas 5, delta-2, and 6. (References to Figure 7.3 substitute arabic numerals for DeVoto's roman-numeral thematic identifiers.) The bass Nebenstimme idea 7 counterpoints theme 6 and ushers in the final link in this melodic chain, the robust theme 8.

Mm.15-24 then form a second run at textural buildup beginning from motives 3 and 4, a kind of counter-exposition (designated "b" in the sketches) that sees the liquidation of the returning motive 2 become the counterpoint (a descending chromatic accompaniment figure in parallel major thirds) to the English horn tune of mm.20-23. That tune is based on cyclic idea alpha (the section labelled "Gruppe B" in one sketch), the counter-expositional replacement of theme 8 which also has its developmental roots in motive 1. A cadential idea (m.23) is developed from alpha (in conjunction with the liquidation of motives 2, 3, and 4). It is combined with a "structural-framing function" brought by the recurrence of idea 5 (mm.23-24), the idea that also began the melodic content of this Exposition (back in m.5).

The end of the larger Exposition (exposition plus counter-exposition) is also marked by the introduction of a "new" motive, 9, with its diminuted imitation (+; at m.24). Several sections in the Marsch show how such last-minute introduction of new material serves a 'terminating' function; the new idea is then often picked in the next section, in a more-or-less explicit instance of linkage technique.
The reader will be spared further demonstrative narration of Figure 7.3. Additional descriptive commentary will be deferred until we examine the individual sections of the work in conjunction the documentary evidence of the sketches and the Particell. However, a very important general observation about the structure of the Marsch emerges from a preliminary overview of Figure 7.3. As stated earlier, on page 1 of the Figure (p.359) I have used the leftover space to the right in order to label the formal subdivisions and to provide brief descriptions of the chief features of their contents. This procedure continues on page 2 (p.360) through the tripartite Transition (m.25ff), the Episode (m.39ff), and the beginning of the Middle Section (C., m.46ff); and again, on page 3 (p.361), through the culminating “stretto takeover” (section D., m.72ff).

Half way through page 4 (p.362), however, the available blank space at the right suddenly shifts to the left: my description of the “second half” of the piece, beginning from the Allegro energico and its head-motive, 23, can move to left of the page, because—apart from the few cross-references to earlier motives that I have added in parentheses—the thematic ideas prior to number 23 now completely disappear! This is a graphic realization of the transformation we experience at this formal juncture, as idea 23 and its cohorts appear to supplant all former materials and usurp the form.

A more succinct version of this abruption, a summary of the first-half–second-half dichotomy in the distribution of thematic ideas, would look like Figure 7.4 (see next page):
Figure 7.4: First-half–second-half dichotomy of idea distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ideas 1 through 22</th>
<th>23 through 30 and 31</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>first half</strong></td>
<td>mm.1–90</td>
<td>1, 5, 10, 12, 15, 18, 20–21, 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>second half</strong></td>
<td>mm.91–126</td>
<td><strong>not found</strong>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(except 8, 2, 5 near Höhepunkt)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Höhepunkt</strong></td>
<td>mm.126–136</td>
<td>δ; portent of closure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>m.136ff</td>
<td>2, 10–11, 13, 15, 20–21, 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>m.149ff</td>
<td>[δ₄]=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coda</strong></td>
<td>m.155ff</td>
<td>3–4 rhythms, 5 flashback,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>re-emergence of cyclic α &amp; β</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>m.162ff</td>
<td>δ₅; 12, 15, 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>m.171–174</td>
<td>4 rhythm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[δ₅]= 18 fanfare</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 7.4 shows which ideas are emphasized in, and which are absent from, the two ‘halves’. The Figure goes on to show what happens later in the second half. The disappearance of earlier ideas holds from mm.91 through mm.117, at which point a recollection of theme 8 (in three-part canon) becomes the first in a series of recapitulatory intrusions into the texture otherwise dominated by the thematic group about idea 23. (The details can be found on p.5 of Fig.7.3 [p.363].) The recurrence of the important “Trillertheme” motive 2 (mm.123) ushers in the Höhepunkt (mm.126); and, once again, idea 5 provides a structural framing moment (mm.125–126). Then, following the climax, cyclic idea delta-2 (δ₅)—a ‘portent of closure’ familiar from both the Präludium (as the delta-1 parenthetic fore-echo, mm.44ff) and Reigen (as delta-2, mm.97/98, 105, and 115)—takes over in a short-lived canonic catharsis.

On page 6 of Figure 7.3 (p.364), my description was obliged to move back to the right, since mm.136–148 recall several of the important “transitional and subordinate” thematic ideas from earlier sections (e.g., [besides motive 2], ideas 10–11 and 13, and themes 15, 20 and 21). This is summarized in Figure 7.4 (above) in the row beginning “m.136ff.” Still in Figure 7.4, at “m.149ff” we see that head-motive 23 again takes over: a
derivation from cyclic idea delta-1 [$\delta_i$] is intimated for the first time—it will be described in detail when we discuss this section. On page 6 of Figure 7.3, my description of this climactic fanfare marziale was, therefore, crammed between head-motive 23, and a parenthetic recognition of ongoing role of "creeping" idea 30—which, at this point, is more a conventional, scalar voice-leading paradigm than a distinctly-profiled thematic entity.

The description of the Coda was placed in the middle of page 6 of Figure 7.3 in order to make room for the gradually emerging (↓) recollections of cyclic ideas alpha and beta on either side of it. Figure 7.4 summarizes the recollections of ideas at m.155ff (3–4, cyclic $\alpha$ and $\beta$, and 5 flashback) and at m.162ff ($\delta_i$ in canon, then 12, 15, and 2). Finally, on the last page (p.7) of Figure 7.3 (p.365), extended verbal description continued in the middle, though the description of the Final Fanfare (mm.171–174) moved back to the right, matching the placement of its predecessor at m.149ff. Figure 7.4 notes that the final fanfare, begun as idea 18, is a highly transformed representation of delta-1: explication is better deferred until we can examine the section in detail, but the derivation is one that would surely occur to no one when idea 18 first appears at m.56.

The overall point here is this: if you lay out DeVoto's 31 themes in the fashion of Figure 7.3 you find that—prior to the fragmentary recollections of ideas which occur around the climax and in the coda—you either have lots of space on the right, or lots of space on the left. Indeed, there is no invasion of what we might call the "middle space" (for ideas 16 through 22) until after the delta-1 idea appears in mm.46–47. And the implication is this: though Berg’s Marsch has enough independent ideas to populate several works, we seem to have at least two different pieces in terms of thematic content, separated at the 'breakout point' by the double bar of m.91. It is, therefore, incumbent upon the analyst to account for this discrepancy, to account for the striking
transformation that occurs when the second half of the Marsch begins in m.91 with the theme built from idea 23 and its cohorts. Elucidating this transformation, its motivic derivation and structural role, and explaining how idea 18 can instigate the concluding fanfare of the work: these are amongst the most fundamental—and enigmatic—analytical challenges that the Marsch poses.

The remainder of this chapter is devoted to commentary on the individual sections of the Marsch, in conjunction with an examination of the evidence of the Particell and the sketches. It is a decidedly 'undemocratic' undertaking: sketches for the opening sections are both more numerous and more detailed than those for most subsequent passages, and Berg's compositional decisions concerning the disposition of the opening materials have far-reaching implications for the rest of the work; as a consequence, a disproportionately large amount of the discussion must be devoted to the beginning of the Marsch. Overall, effort is made to keep descriptive commentary to a minimum and to avoid recapitulating matters already covered quite adequately by DeVoto (1984) so that we may instead concentrate on the documentary issues and can bring forward new analytical observations on the formal design, pitch-class set content, and voice-leading structure of the individual sections. The analytical problems of the second half of the piece have been alluded to above; from a documentary perspective, the pickings are slim: we shall note a few interesting alterations to the Particell, and will examine the approximately half-dozen (highly-tentative) extant sketches for m.91 to the end. For the later sections of the work our focus will be on large-scale design, and on aspects of closure and thematic transformation.

We now turn to the individual sections of the Marsch, beginning with the various 'starts' that define its exposition.
AN EXPOSITION IN THREE STARTS AND A FIT (MM.1–24)

As Berg said, this is not "the march of an upright person marching cheerfully, but rather ... the 'March of an Asthmatic' (Berg to Schoenberg, 10-04-1914)." The asthmatic fitfulness is apparent in the offbeat wheezings of the initial motives. (For the identification of these motives, readers less familiar with the work may at this point wish to refer to the published score, to DeVoto’s Table [Figure 7.2, above], or to the facsimile of Berg’s Particell or the analytical notes given below [Exx.7.1 and 7.2].) Motive I (the cellos’ 014 cell <78B>), forced to catch its breath on the downbeat, is already ‘out of step’ and, after overstaying beat 3, sucks back air on the second half of beat 4 (emphasized by a little explosion on tamtam). Motive II (the clarinet’s 016-based <32(A)9>) also misses the downbeat, only to land on a throat-clearing tremolo/trill that connects beats 3 and 4 (the final note emphasized by harp).

Rhythmic motives III (English horn <76 6 6>) and IV (the trumpet-imitating oboe tattoo <555 5>) are able to establish the metric structure more clearly, though only by tripping and stumbling to their respective downbeats. And the subsequent chain of melodic ideas (V–delta-2–VI) does little to settle matters until theme VIII seizes control in m.11. Even the relatively square beginning of theme VI feels dislocated by a half-measure; so that we experience a bit of ‘Hauptstimme purgatory’ through m.10, before VIII reaffirms the downbeat in m.11. To bend Yeats’s splendid phrase, “How can we know the dancer from the dance?” (end of Among School Children, from The Tower): we can, by this point, no longer tell the “marcher” from the “marched.”

Though this asthmatic fitfulness is programmatically essential, it is not the kind of ‘fit’ that the above subtitle invokes. I am concerned not with ‘fitful motives’ but with a ‘fitting together of motives’, Berg’s establishment of a motivic complex which—in the manner of multiple counterpoint—can then
be unravelled, or variously combined, as the piece progresses; and that can be used as the generative (or at least initiating) basis for many subsequent thematic transformations. At the end of our discussion of the Exposition, we shall return to this issue 'motivic fit' and use it as a springboard to our examination of the later sections. My reference to "three starts" concerns the fact that the Marsch has an Exposition (mm.1-14[or 16]) and a Counter-Exposition (mm.15[or 17]-24). The third start is a 'false one': sketches and Particell show a late deletion from the beginning of the piece. We shall look at Exposition and Counter-Exposition before considering the sketches for both.

'Start the first': mm.1-14, Exposition

Example 7.1 reproduces the Exposition of the Marsch in a facsimile of the first two pages of Berg's Particell (A-Wn F 21 Berg 12, fol.18-18v; a general description was provided in Chapter 3). The first page contains mm.1-8 of the score, the second mm.9-16. (The reader may find analytical Example 7.2, below, of some value in deciphering problematic passages in the facsimile.) Both pages have interesting documentary features. The annotations at the top of the first page refer to Berg's two arrangements of the piece (as discussed in Chapter 6): one projected for a Verein-type chamber orchestra, the other for the two-piano eight-hand arrangement. At the top left, we read "III. Kammerorchester bearbeitung" with a vertical list of instruments crossed out. At the right, the R and L (right and left) indications are colour-coded—blue for the "Spieler des 1. Klaviers," red for players of the second piano—so that they can be used to mark those passages of the Particell that are assigned to each player in the arrangement. The indications, however, do not last much beyond the first two pages. The margins of these pages (as in the rest of the Particell) are used to tabulate in ink the instrumentation and staffing requirements for the move from Particell to full score.
Example 7.1(a): Marsch Particell, page 1, mm.1-8
(A-Wn F 21 Berg 12, fol.18; facsimile)
Example 7.1(b): Marsch Particell, page 2, mm.9-16
(A-Wn F 21 Berg 12, fol.18v; facsimile)
Turning now to the musical text of the facsimile, we are immediately struck by the appearance of the first system, for it is clear that the Marsch begins with a deletion. We shall return to this 'false start' later. First, however, attention is drawn to another visual aspect of the Particell—one with important analytical implications: this concerns the choices Berg makes in the system layout of the document and in the staffing distribution of thematic ideas. On the first page, for example, we note: that motives I and III are laid out as a contrapuntal combination on the bottom staff; that motive II occupies the middle space, expanding to three staves in the second system as the idea develops in imitation and inversion; and, finally, that rhythmic motive IV, well-separated from the others in the first system, is stemmed downward (as an inner voice) so that the upward-stemmed melodic ideas of the passage—motives V and delta-2 in mm.5–8—can be draped around motive IV’s chromatic creep upwards from F to G.

By the second page of the Particell, however, this layout is already in trouble. Melodic idea VI (begun on the previous page) continues on the top staff of m.9, now split off from motive IV which is on the next staff down. The tremolos of motive II, formerly spread over three staves, now unite in warbling thirds. Conversely, the former contrapuntal combination of motives I and III is now split, because the registral ambitions of bass motive VII (the continuation of the development of motive I on the bottom staff) can not be accommodated with the rhythmic ambitions of motive III (on the next-to-bottom staff), which continues to “run amok” through the remainder of the system.

The mess in mm.10–12 has several causes and can best be explained by tracking the ideas. The bottom staff (at m.10) continues motive VII; note the arrow that shows the motive’s transfer to treble clef three staves higher on the page. Continuing there, we find Hauptstimme theme VIII, which,
beginning from its tied note G4, is extravagantly stemmed first to include, and then shift to, the next higher staff for the final measure of the system. In this way, theme VIII meets up (in m.12, at pitch C5) with the chromatic creep of motive IV that began with F4 (in mm.3-4) and which continued as an inner voice to the melodic ideas of mm.5-8 (V, delta-2, and VI) and mm.9-12 (where the motion is attached to the motive-II thirds which we will speak of in the next paragraph). A second voice for motive IV is split off from pitch A4 in theme VIII (m.12) and is placed on the staff just below (see the sixteenth-note triplets on A4 and G#4). Together, these (sum-10) dyads wedge outward from A–C# through G#–D to G–Eb (top of next system), where the upper Eb joins the Hauptstimme and the lower G4 creeps its way [back?] to F4 in a rhythmic liquidation of the motive.

Other thematic routings in mm.10–12 present a more complex picture due to shifts of register. In m.9, the top melodic line of motive VI proceeds on the same staff through m.10, but is then cast down three staves to the bass clef as the horn Nebenstimme that, in m.12, crash lands on the tremolo thirds of motive II. Thus, the quality of fractious fragmentation which besets the Hauptstimme in its move from motive VI in mm.8–9 to the takeover by motive VIII in m.11 is highly evident in the thematic routings of this system and in the supplementary details placed above it.

To recall Boulez, however, it is the “immoderate” elaboration of motive II that brings about the first of the Particell’s several ‘balloons of insertion’; here, at the top of the page. The motive–II-derived thirds at m.9, third staff, continue through the first two beats of m.10. But Berg found he had insufficient room to proceed with the glissando-like thirty-second-note woodwind figures, so—though the figures are already crammed into the existing system—he ballooned the whole interlocking gesture onto the staves above.
These thirds, like the creeping chromatics of motive IV, have an underlying voice-leading pattern. They begin with the D4–F#4 dyad in m.8 (violas), an inner voice to melody motive VI, which begins with the same dyad an octave higher (see p.373 facsimile, lower system, end of top line). Full narration of the voice-leading details of this passage from the facsimile would prove both convoluted and tedious, but the gist of Berg's procedure can be reported more succinctly as follows: the D–F# (m.8) is transferred up an octave in m.11 (p.374, lines 3 and 7); there, aided by the woodwind glissandi and marked by the harp, it begins a registrally-displaced chromatic creep to the Gb2–Bb2 third of the motive-II crash landing (m.12, horns, plus cellos and contrabassoon; p.374, line 10); the thirds again continue somewhat complicatedly, but conclude with the exposition-framing delta-2 tag; this tag begins from the D3–F#3 and Bb2–D3 sixteenth notes (m.13, last eighth, cellos and horns; p.374, line 22;) and ends with G3–B3 (m.14, b.3), the framing third span of the opening cello motive (m.1)—now an octave higher at the close of this first exposition.

Several of the features described in the preceding paragraphs are summarized in analytical Example 7.2 (not a transcription of Berg's Particell). The Example also identifies the motives, ideas, and themes according to DeVoto's thematic table, shows their pitch-class set structure and describes their development. Score and Particell differ in a few pitch details (see the parenthetic notes in mm.6, 8 and 9): in general, the Particell readings favour more straightforward or 'normative' variants of the motives. The ubiquitousness of the Opus 6 cyclic (or generative) trichords, 014 and 016, is notable. Melodic chain V–delta-2–VI (mm.5–9) is forged via linkage technique, the last two notes of each idea becoming the first two notes of the next. (This linkage is also indicated in the musical examples of DeVoto's Table of Themes; our Figure 7.2, p.353, above.)
Example 7.2(a): Exposition, mm.1–14[or 16]—mm.1–8, analytical notes
Example 7.2(b): Exposition (cont’d)—mm.9–16, analytical notes
Motives V and delta-2 are also cyclic: motive V is built from a registrally-manipulated linking of two 014 trichords (SC 5–37 [03458]), like the fortissimo interjection idea of Präludium mm.11–13. (A decidedly more abstract 'linkage' also exists between delta-2 and the beginning of VI: both pc-segments effect SC 7–28 [0135679].) Motive VI is distinguished by two instances of wholetone-subset tetrachord 4–25 [0268], the second of these non-contiguous (<B5...71>, m.9). A voice-leading conceit of chromatic creeping underlies much of the Exposition. The upward creep of motive IV (including its two-part split and directional change at A–C#, m.12) may be read directly off the Example. More subtle, registrally-displaced downward creeping may underlie the succession of ideas: see the asterisks [*], beginning above the top staff in m.1. Additional asterisks in parentheses (*), beginning with the D–F# third in m.8, mark the more "indulgent" creeping which was noted in our discussion of the Particell; these creepings come to a confluence in the delta-2 tag of mm.13–14, where the final third, G–B, is approached from above.

Overall, the projection of major thirds (see the circled alphabetical labels on the Example) suggests an underlying referential context: the projection begins from G–B (as the framing interval of motive I, m.1) proceeds through D–F# (as the first dyad of idea VI, m.6), to Eb–G (as the first dyad of theme VIII, m.11, though anticipated in the bass at m.6), and Gb–Bb (as the crash landing on motive II, m.12), then—via the D–F# and Bb–D, and the approach from above in the delta-2 tag—it returns to G–B (m.14, an octave above its original position in m.1) at the end of the Exposition.

Consider the preceding thirds in the form of the string < G–B–Eb–F#–Bb–D>, pcs <7B36A2>: this is a representation of SC 6–20 [014589]. The set-class may (amongst other possibilities) be partitioned as a linking of 014 trichords (014 plus 589) or as an interlocking of 048 augmented trichords (048 and 159). (SC 6–20 has a high degree of symmetry: it is invariant under the
operations $T_0$, $T_4$, $T_8$, $T_{11}$, $T_{15}$, and $T_{29}$). The emphasis in the Marsch is on the 014 trichords and on the separate ‘major-third’ components of the 048 trichords (though the woodwind glissandi of mm.10-11 realize the full ‘augmented triads’; and theme VIII is later collaterally thickened with complete 048s, at m.29). It will be appreciated that the significant thirds circled on the Example can all be constructed from dyads found in the 6–20 pc set.

This is not to argue that SC 6–20 is literally present at the opening as a ‘referential chord’ in the way that the Präludium and Reigen establish such sonorities. To be sure, the tones G–B–Eb–F#–Bb–D (<7B36A2>, also SC 6–20 [014589]) could be extracted from the first three motives, but this would ignore the emphasis on Ab in motive I and the conflict between Bb and A in trill-motive II: <329>, and its contextually less-stable initial trichord, 015 <32A>. (By convention, the adjacency pitch of the motive-II trill, C4, is ignored in these set determinations: its inclusion yields 5–12 [01356] for the motive. The real role of the C-natural, however, is to provide smooth connection from D to A3.) A mechanical view of the build-up of pc content in motives I and II (still omitting trill pc0) produces a number of familiar sets: <78B 3> (also <7B32>) 4–19 [0148], <78B 32> 5–22 [01478], <78B 32A> 6–19 [013478], and <78B 32A9> 7–6 [0123478]. The addition of the F# of motive III produces SC 8–7 [01234589] and adding the F of motive IV yields SC 9–3 [012345689], which is, incidentally, the covering complement of the opening [014].

A more plausible understanding of Berg’s procedure in constructing the musical space of the opening passage focuses on the chaining together 014 motives in both prime and inverse configurations: 78B, B23, 236, and 67A, as well as 69A. At the same time alternative layouts of the space are suggested by the registral ‘gap’ between motive I and II (the fact the D, pc2, is in a higher register) and by the way that motive III ‘fills’ the gap inside motive II (the G of motive III seems to pass from the A at the end of II down to F#); i.e.:
7B 3(6)A2, or 7B 3(6)92. The former is SC 6–20; the latter emphasizes the framing pitch A3 (pc9) of motive II and produces SC 6–31 [014579]. With the addition of the F5 of oboe motive IV, the sets become <7B36A25> 7–21 [014589] and <7B36925> 7–26 [0134579]. (SC 7–21 actually reappears as a prominent verticality at the Codetta, *Etwas breiter*, m.76f: as <5B9 4180>.)

Theme VIII (mm.11–16) is the culmination of the Exposition. It combines the 014 trichord of motive I (as <376>) and the 016 trichord underlying motive II (as <760> and <601>). The C5 reclaims the register abandoned in the adumbration of idea VI (at m.10) and a chaining together of ic4 and ic5 segments moves the phrase to a high Ab. In context, this Ab5 seems a registrally displaced adjacency (neighbour-note) to the initial G4 (m.11): note the the wedge motions and pitch-class associations (marked with dotted lines in the Example, − − − − ) at the beginning (m.11, Eb–G–F#), middle (m.12, G–F#–Ab), and end (m.13, Ab–F#–G, the return to G4) of the theme. Following the high Ab, the line picks up from Eb5. The annotations on the Example show how a lower-voice ic5 chain is subtended from the Ab5; the structural upper voice, meanwhile, proceeds by ic2 from Eb5 down to the returning G4. From there, the ‘fallout’ continues with articulations of D4 and Bb3 in m.14, and ends—with the recovery of rhythmic motive III at its original pitch level—on F#3 in m.16. The Example thereby shows that the emphasized tones in the descending second half of theme VIII are: Eb5–B4–G4–D4–Bb3–F#3, or <3B72A6>, again SC 6–20 [014589]—indeed, with the same pcs as the 6–20 posited above. (And, if the reader is wondering about that ‘passing’ A3 in m.15: its inclusion produces SC 7–21.)

Though “harmonic” considerations play a peripheral role in this textural build-up, SC 6–20 is also present vertically at the end of m.13, as <3BA267>, just when G4 returns in the melody. SC 6–20 is also formed by the combination of the delta-2 tag and the tail of theme VIII in m.14, as staggered
parallel 048 trichords: <915> to <804>.. The chromatic continuation of these 048 trichords in the approach to G3–B3, coupled with the expectation of the normal upward-flipping major third at the end of delta-2, suggests that D#4 is 'due' in m.14: that pitch comes with the return of leading motive II in the Counter-Exposition (at m.17). When the framing third (G–B) of motive I returns in m.16 (an octave higher and with pitches reversed) it is joined by motive III (G–F#) at its original pitch level, and by motive IV two octaves below its original location (the F4 oboe tattoo rhythm now on timpani at F2): this effects a kind of 'structural voice-exchange' of the elements of the opening. Harmonically, the pitches of m.16 represent SC 4–5 [0126] <567B>: this same set-class links us to the Counter-Exposition.

'Start the second': mm.15–24, Counter-Exposition

Example 7.3 (continuing Ex.7.2) shows the Counter-Exposition, which is really underway in m.17 with the re-establishment of leading motive II. (Mm.15–16 serve to return 'vamp' motives III and IV to their proper pitch locations.) SC 4–5 [0126] (cf. m.16) recurs at the beginning of the Counter-Exposition: pcs 5 and 6 of motives IV and III are held invariant while the G–B third which framed the Exposition is replaced by the C–E third that begins leading motive II. Motive II is treated to a modified 'presentation', its basic idea (b.i.) extended on repetition and followed by an 'interpolation', a kind of 'commentary' in parallel major thirds approaching the final Bb–D from below and above. The main "new" thematic idea of this section is cyclic idea 'alpha' (the English horn tune at m.20ff). The idea is accompanied by the liquidated remnants of motive II, a succession of parallel thirds linked forward from the interpolation of m.19. The 'cadential idea' in m.23 is a 'triadic tucket' (DeVoto 1984, 432) that returns the final C5–F#4 tritone of alpha back to G; it concludes with a similar tritone drop, C#4–G3.
Example 7.3: Counter-Exposition, mm.15[17]-24, analytical notes

continuation — cadential idea — post-cad. shrapnel

liquidation of IV V (structural framing)
The other motives in the Counter-Exposition include an upward-creeping variant of III (from <G3–F#3> up to <B3–Bb3>) and a downward-creeping variant of IV (from F2 down to A1; partitioned as F–D and C–A). The rhythmic profile of motive IV is liquidated (at m.23) into a framing statement of idea V: which began the melodic material of the Exposition in m.5, and which now, down the octave with its own T+1 statement in parallel major sevenths below (cf. motive II), returns to frame the larger Exposition (exposition and counter-exposition). M.24 also sees the insertion of a ‘new’ idea, IX-1, as ‘post-cadential shrapnel’: it is ultimately alpha-derived, the result of a compression of alpha’s 014 trichord into a 013 embellishing motion with the rising major seventh of motive II tacked on. The idea becomes the basis for much of the Middle-Section proper (m.46ff), and, more immediately, it serves as an anacrusis to the chordal ideas (motives X and XI) throughout the Transition (at mm.24–25, 27–28, 30–31, 32–33, and 34–35).

**Sketches for the Marsch opening: some tentative ‘starts’**

We now turn to an examination of the sketches for these opening sections of the Marsch. The earliest item for all of Opus 6 is the sketch in the Altenbergglieder sketchbook: Berg 65, folio 20v. The sketch is nearly indecipherable, but a transcription is offered in Example 7.4. (Description of the sketchbook is found in Chapter 3.) The top three lines are—unmistakably—the rhythms of Marsch motives III, II, and I. The text at the right refers to the way Berg envisions the “Melodie” will “develop and come to life from the accompaniment through swellings-out, roll-call like.” (Quotations from Berg’s sketched textual jottings are often paraphrased, in part because they are fragmentary and nearly illegible, but mostly so that they may be folded into the discussion with some semblance of grammatical continuity.)
Example 7.4: Transcription of Berg 65 (Op.4), fol.20v, sketch for Op.6 opening

Notes: See also Ch.2, p.63; Ch.3, Fig.3.4, p.119 and commentary. Text at lines 2–5 refers to Op.6; boxed off sketch (scribbled out) refers to Op.4, no.1, mm.15–17; surrounding text to melodic return, m.29ff.
The text lower on this sketch page refers to a different “Melodie,” that of the first Altenberglieder. And it seems clear from the page layout that the miniature Marsch sketch was there first: hence, my suggestion of its remarkably early date—July 1912. The boxed off music is a rough detail-sketch for the double bass parts of mm.16–17 of the song; the text concerns the repetition of the (vocal) melody, “entwined with solo violin, pizzicato in sharp sixteenths-note rhythm”: the reference is to m.29ff of the song; the rhythms with crescendo at the right of the sketch may be discerned in the bassoon, oboe, and col legno second violin echoes in the song.

A rather similar sketch for the Marsch opening is found on page 7 of Berg 13/ii (the Wozzeck sketchbook). The sketch is transcribed in Example 7.5. The similarities to Berg 65 fol.20v are apparent; even the textual notes on the two sketches are closely related, though the soldierly-motivic roll-call has switched from “swelling” (“ausschwellend”) to “bouncing ” (“aufprallend”). More importantly, the musical idea to the right and below, is a schematic version of theme alpha; and, it is identified as “Gruppe B”—the military pun to “squad B” perhaps singularly appropriate. The text at the bottom refers to a “retreat” (“zurückziehend”) followed by a new “signalling forth” of ‘a’ and ‘B’. The overall description suggests that military imagery played an important role in Berg’s conception of the opening texture; though, since this is ‘conception before conscription’, it is decidedly more detached and ironic, less autobiographical, than the more realistic scene-setting march idioms in Wozzeck. In any case, the descriptions are an excellent match for the end of the Exposition and the beginning of the Counter-Exposition.
Example 7.5: Transcription of Berg 13/ii, page 7, sketch for opening

Notes:
1. page stroked through
2. parentheses in original
3. very faint
4. word overwritten, last part nearly illegible
'Start the third': 'false start' in Particell deletion and related sketches

The tentative presence of theme alpha in the sketch of Example 7.5 leads us to a discussion of our 'third start', the 'false start' found at the opening of the Particell—since, as we shall see, it is a variant of 'alpha' that the deletion removes. **Example 7.6(a)** shows the content of the deletion at the beginning of the Particell: the opening cello motive originally began with a neighbour-note motion, G–Ab–G, and then moved to a statement of motive I; the repetition of motive I was then joined by a statement of motive II up a semitone (T+1) from its version in the score (i.e., beginning from E3, rather than from Eb3 as it does in the subsequent measure following the deletion). The sketches tell more of the history of this 'false start'. (I break precedent in this Example and transcribe *individual lines* from various pages of Berg 13/ii rather than whole sketch pages, since the 'false start'-related evidence is somewhat scattered while the remaining contents of the relevant pages are not pertinent to this topic). **Example 7.6(b)** shows that the T+1 shift of motive II was once contemplated for motives IV and V as well. (The sketch continues with delta-2 similarly transposed T+1; so that it ends with Eb5–G5 rather than D–F#; the pitch content of idea VI is not present in the sketch.) One result of this transposed earlier version is that idea V includes the pitch-class succession F#–F–E; i.e., it matches the pitch-class content of the core chromatic creep of *Präludium* interjection idea ('A2', mm.11–13). Apart from this matching pc content, however, the thematic interrelation (between ideas V and A2) is far from explicit in the sketch, since the sketched idea is split between two voices.
Example 7.6: 'False start' in the Particell and its history in the sketches

(a) *(Entry in parentheses deleted from Particell)*

m.1 of score, bass only

Berg 13/ii.
p.6, line 1

score...

etc...

Berg 13/ii.
p.12, line 10

Berg 13/ii.
p.13, line 5
Example 7.6(c) transcribes a sketch from Berg 13/ii, page 12, line 10: this is clearly a development of motive I in the bass register, but one which—unlike its version in the score (cf. Particell and score, bassline, mm.6-9)—actually matches the continuation of motive alpha as found in the English horn tune of m.20ff. Finally, Example 7.6(d), from Berg 13/ii, page 12, line 5 (the bottom staff of an otherwise empty four-stave system), shows the version of the motive that was deleted from the beginning of the Particell. Note that, in its second measure, this sketch shows both the returning neighbour-note version of m.1 and the move to B-natural of motive I. The third measure shows motive II from E3, as also deleted in the Particell. The top of this sketch page is marked ‘A’; and also ‘a’ at the end of the sketch. (The remainder of the sketch, not shown, continues in a fragmentary second system with the first two notes of motive III [lines 5 and 10], and with a repeat of motive II still from E-natural [line 9]; it concludes [line 7] with motive IV and the first two notes of motive V now, ‘correctly’, on F and Ab–F.)

Idea ‘alpha’, the English horn tune in the Counter-Exposition in m.20, is so-designated because it is based on the cyclic idea present in the preceding pieces: in the Präludium, the [014] cells of the main (m.16) and subordinate ideas (m.24) and the more fully developed ‘alpha’ outburst in doubled thirds (m.37) following the climax; in Reigen, the opening theme and its (again more fully developed) waltz derivations (first at m.20ff)—the last providing the closest analogue to this version in the Marsch. Locally, idea alpha is foreshadowed in the development of motive I (cf. bass mm.5–6, in particular), a relation that is more explicitly intuited in the bass-register sketch transcribed in Ex.7.6(c).

Overall, then, the ‘false start’ of the Particell shows the pitch-class string of alpha as it eventually appears only in the Counter-Exposition (m.20ff). The deleted presentation of motive II on E-natural is also perhaps best understood
not as a premature anticipation of its local T+1 transposition in m.5 of the score, but rather—like the bass-voice deletion—as an augury of the pitch level of motive II that initiates the Counter-Exposition (m.17). The net result of this deleted 'false start' to the Marsch provides documentary proof for, and a concrete realization of, what DeVoto has called Berg's "conscious principle" of "thematic nonstandardization" (1984, 408): the deleted measures hide, or at least suppress until m.20, the derivation of the initial gesture (motive I) from cyclic idea alpha. And thus, the Marsch—despite the smooth surface link of its initial pitch (G2) from the last note of Reigen, and despite its hyperventilate use of familiar cyclic cells 014 and 016—opens with a more immediate forward impetus (the 'hiccup' to B2, rather than the neighbouring return to G2), and with a less apparent thematic pedigree (the derivation from cyclic idea alpha) than the deleted Particell passage would have provided. As to the various 'false start' sketches shown in our Example 7.6, these are followed in Berg 13/ii by a two-page continuity sketch which is the most detailed for all of Opus 6.

'Good start': Berg 13/ii, pages 14–15

Berg 13/ii/14–15 is a continuity sketch of the complete texture of the Exposition, mm.5–10 and 11–15. The two pages are presented in facsimile in Example 7.7; a transcription is offered in Example 7.8. The sketch, though remarkably detailed, is incorrect in numerous pitch details, the more so as it proceeds into its second page. Amongst the more striking features of the sketch beginning are: (1) Berg's formal designations "[A]a" for the leading motive 2 and "Ab" (or perhaps A6?) for woodwind [Holz] idea 6; and (2) his numbering of motives 1 through 4 according to order of entry—though perhaps a predictable coincidence, this numbering exactly matches DeVoto's Table.
Example 7.7(a): Facsimile of Berg 13/ii, p.14, sketch for Marsch, mm.5–10
Example 7.8(a): Transcription of Berg 13/ii, p.14, sketch for Marsch, mm.5–10

Notes:

1. "folgt" or "folgend"; page stroked out
2. faint lower stems
3. bass clef at left
4. illegible erasures from first note to faint chord
5. F# overwritten and scribble out before D
6. faint lower parts
7. F# crossed out; C# above (?)
Example 7.8(b): Transcription of Berg 13/ii, p.15, sketch for Marsch, mm.11-15

Notes: page heavily smudged, overwritten, faint remnants of erasures.

1 staves hand-drawn through run-in header; paged stroked out
2 first triplet crossed out  3 [passage scribbled out, decipherable]
4 faint (idea VIII)  5 triplet crossed out  6 [motive] “2” [?]
7 faint underlayers of erasure  8 [motive] “3” [?] or scribble
In Berg's sketch, the numbering of motives perhaps serves less to identify the mere order of entry, than it does to identify 'layers' for motivic combination in a potential multiple-counterpoint texture. We shall return to the generalizable aspects of such a multiple-counterpoint motivic 'fit' after making a few observations on the details of this remarkable sketch.

**Page 14, (pickup to)m.5 through m.10:** As in the Particell, this sketch shows the contrapuntal combination of motives 1 and 3 (on line 5), the leading role of motive 2 (note the location of formal label 'a' on line 4), and the interlocking of motive 4 (beamed upwards at the beginning of line 2) with the melodic complex (ideas V-delta-2-VI). For clarification, Berg places motive 4's chromatic creep from F to G through F# above the system (on line 1), though it then continues inside the texture on line 8. Also, at the top left and centre of the sketch page, Berg indicates that the sketch is to follow measures 2 and 3 and he provides some rhythmic detail for motive 1. The inversional development of motive 2 (line 4 and beginning of line 9) is predicted in the sketch, but not yet its imitative workings-out. Similarly, the pitch and rhythmic details of motive 3's 'run amok' (lines 5 and 10, then 9) are also not yet fully worked out.

The continuation of motive 1—it's relation to the 'false start' and to motive alpha (as outlined above)—falls apart in the sketch after the first line (line 5): though the last note of that line, F#, and the first note of its continuation (line 10), E-natural, would be the next pitches 'due' in a mechanical extension of alpha (i.e., G-Ab-G-Bb-C-F#-E-Eb). Nonetheless, in terms of matching the score, the prominent Eb2 of m.8 and the C2 which begins idea 7 are notably absent from the sketch. In fact, bass idea 7 is rather roughly conceived here; though Berg apparently thought the idea was clear enough: the designation 'Baß' and the 'X' are a cross-reference to page 41 of the sketchbook where—as we shall see in our later discussion of
that passage—Berg planned a recapitulation of this bass idea in conjunction with theme 8, following the flux chords of m.136ff.

The woodwind idea in mm.8–9 is crisply conceived, and is identified as "Ab": actually, this label probably reads "A6" rather than "b", since this is not Berg's normal way of writing a lower-case 'b'—which label would match DeVoto's "theme VI", though the '6' is not preceded by any motive labeled '5' in Berg's sketch.] The "weniger" in mm.9–10 does not begin to account for the textural burial of this Hauptstimme once the glissando woodwind thirds are added at the Particell stage.

**Page 15, mm.11–15:** The entries on the upper staff (line 1, with extended stafflines drawn through the run-in header) reflect the continuing importance of motive 4 as an underlying feature of the structural voice-leading of the exposition; note, in particular, the 'completion' of the motion, as D5–Eb5, which Berg shows on line 6. The scribbled-out entry on line 2 hides a counterpoint of 014- and 016-cell triplets (see the transcription) similar to the idea on line 4. The idea on line 4 itself is the continuation, for horn, of the idea 6; it proceeds fairly clearly until the tremolo 'crash landing' on motive 2 in mm.11–12 (sketch lines 4 and 9). The tremolos lack their lower-third (and, by extension, augmented trichord) doublings in the sketch, though the underlying ic3 basis of the main notes (Bb to Db to E), in their approach to the delta-2 tag (mm.13–14), is quite apparent. (Note, too, that the tag also lacks its lower-third doublings and that the last sixteenth of m.13 is an Eb3 in the sketch rather than the 048-determining D3 <A26> of the score.) Lines 5 and 10 of the sketch show that motive 3's 'run amok' is still unclear in its pitch details but already fairly accurate in its rhythmic design; the return of motive 4 in the bass register (mm.14–15, line 10 of the sketch) is more subtly and smoothly achieved at the Particell stage. Finally, Hauptstimme theme 8 (emerging in line 3, and continuing on line 7) is entirely clear in its
conception and pitch content and is quite apparently the leading idea of the end of this exposition sketch. The "a" at the end of line 7 probably refers to the return of motive 2 which is next 'due' at the beginning of the Counter-Exposition (m.17), though it may refer to the whole exposition as a formal unit.

**Continuation of the start: sketches for the Counter-Exposition**

Following the 'false start' of page 13 of sketchbook Berg 13/ii and the 'good start' of the complete-texture continuity sketches of pages 14–15, Berg continued with three pages of sketches (pp.16–18) that blend some elements of the Counter-Exposition (mm.15–24) with others for the Transition (mm.25–38). *Example 7.9* transcribes the sketch on page 16. It is immediately apparent that the textural detail which characterized the two preceding sketch pages has entirely disappeared. Sketch page 16 corresponds to mm.16–19 of the score [though numbered mm."18–22" in the sketch]. In striking contrast to pp.14–15, only the leading idea of each measure is present: m.16 shows the combination of motives III and IV which vamps before the re-entry in m.17 of leading motive II (only its top voice is sketched). The 'alpha' tune is marked "E H" for English horn, and the repetition of the basic idea in the sketch ends with a vertical dyad, G–Bb (rather like that indecisive vertical third G–B-natural in the 'false start' alpha sketch of p.13, line 5 [Ex.7.6(d), above]). The end of the sketch on p.16 is marked 'b', a cross-reference to "Gruppe B" (recall sketch page 7, Ex.7.5). The full version of the alpha theme follows on page 18, where it is prefaced with 'b'. (Note that the sketch from page 16 does not continue directly on page 17, which—with some thematic confusion, as we shall see below—concerns the Transition.) Page 18 of Berg 13/ii is transcribed in *Example 7.10*. 
Example 7.9: Transcription of Berg 13/ii, page 16, sketch for mm.16–19

Notes:
1. page stroked through
2. parentheses in original
3. "b" formal label
Example 7.10: Transcription of Berg 13/ii, page 18, sketch for m.22ff

Notes:

1. E overwritten by lower C#
2. Page crossed out; "b" formal label
3. Faint triplet
4. Very faint stick entries
For the first system of Example 7.10, the measure numbers of the sketch correspond to those of the score. The entry on line 2 shows the continuation and cadential ideas of the 'alpha' tune. The system also includes the framing gesture of idea V (line 5) and terminating motive IX-I (revised on line 1). Note that the sketch implies that the upper voice of idea V 'leads'; its 'doubling' at the major seventh below, which occurs in the score, is absent from the sketch. More strikingly, the closing—or exposition-'framing'—function which we have attributed to motive V is not yet determined in the sketch: indeed, Berg actually contemplates its continuation with delta-2 and idea VI (as occurred in mm.5–9 of the score). Berg's sketch also shows that, in addition to this far-more-literal plan for counter-exposition, a quasi-sequential development of alpha was projected (line 7). Such a development of alpha does materialize in the score, but only as part of the Transition (mm.25–38). A second sketch for this development is found on page 17 of Berg 13/ii; it is discussed in conjunction with the Transition, below.

'Fit': the multiple-counterpoint texture aspects of Berg's exposition

As we bring this discussion of the Exposition, Counter-Exposition and the various sketches for the opening of the Marsch to a close, we are left with a question: why is so much motivic and pitch detail found for mm.4–15 in the sketches on pages 14–15 (Exx.7.7 and 7.8) when, in general (as we have seen in Exx.7.9 and 7.10, and shall continue to see in subsequent transcriptions), there is so little such detail in the rest of the sketchbook? Unless another yet-undiscovered sketchbook exists for the second half of the Marsch; unless Berg had many pages (now missing) of single-leaf 'piano sketches' that worked out various sections of the piece (more developed than that one anomalous page from Berlin [D-Bspk N.mus.ms.70, described in Chapter 3]): we must recognize this detailed two-page sketch—like the three-
page continuity sketch for the chordal progression underlying the Präludium (A-Wst pp.23–24, and 26) and the combined Reigen-Präludium sketch for the delta chord theme (A-Wst p.32)—may have broader formal implications.

Of course, part of the importance of the passage is attributable to its priority—in the chronology of the composition (both as product and process) and in our listening experience. But the opening also serves as a structural generator for much of the rest of the piece. The sketch on pp.14–15 establishes a ‘multiple-counterpoint texture’ of motivic relations. And that complex of motives is unravelled in two broad ways as the piece proceeds, ways that we might characterize as: “combinations” and “incipits”.

In the first case, the motives numbered 1 through 4 in Berg’s sketch serve not only as motivic identifiers but as textural combinations. Consider, abstractly, the possible combinations of these four motivic elements: they can stand alone as four individual ideas (‘singletons’), they can be combined in six pairs, or four ‘triads’ (three-member groups), and, of course, as a complete ‘tetrad’ texture of four elements. This count does not concern itself with the order—or, in textural terms, the vertical placement—of the elements. Figure 7.5 summarizes the simple abstract possibilities and then shows how many of these combinations are loosely exploited over the course of the Marsch.

In the second case, the distinctive rhythmic profiles of motives 1 through 4 are used as the “incipits” to subsequent thematic ideas. (See Fig.7.5, bottom). Thus, the motives permeate the later texture in a contrapuntal manner even when their full contents are not in play. The thoroughness with which Berg pursued the combination of ideas in this important sketch allowed him to concentrate, in later sketches, on the broad formal and textural design of work, knowing that many thematic details could be worked out in Particell from the combination and transformation of ideas extractable from this ‘multiple-counterpoint texture sketch’.
Figure 7.5: combinations of motives arising from the 'multiple-counterpoint texture sketch' of Berg 13/ii, pages 14-15

The sketch, Particell, and score begin like this:

motives ... “Melodie” (ideas 5-delta-2-6), etc. 

3 ... These and subsequent combinations of motives 
2 ... can also be read from Figure 7.3, the ‘measure-run’ 
1 ... through DeVoto’s 31 Themes, above.

This results in the immediate, ‘additive’, combination of motives: 1, 1+2, 
1+2+3, and 1+2+3+4; before the “Melodie” takes over and the motives are free 
to develop independently in the accompaniment texture. But it also suggests 
the abstract possibility of the following combinations:

singleton: 1, 2, 3, 4 
pairs: 12, 13, 14, 23, 24, 34 
triads: 123, 124, 134, 234 
tetrad: 1234

Combinations: as the piece continues, numerous combinations occur ...

m.1ff: 1, 12, 123, 1234; 
m.15ff: 4, 34, 234; 
m.20ff: 134 (I as alpha; II liquidated as accompanying thirds) 
m.39f: 4 
m.50–53: 23 (m.53 diminuted/compressed in *Flottes Marschtempo*) 
m.58: 2 (without 3) 
m.60: 3 (without 2) 
(m.62): 3 (as rhythm of accompanying chords, cf. XXVIII at m.107ff) 
(m.66): 3 (proto-serial transformation into XXI; XIII-II) 
m.88–91: 4 (... second half of Marsch; IV as pickup to XXIII-1) 
m.106–107: 4 (... XXIII-1, pickup to “second run”) 
m.107: 3 (as rhythm of accompaniment motive XXVIII martellato) 
(m.111): 14 (hints of 14 combination in move to F pedal) 
(m.123): 2, [25], 2(3)5 (return of 2, framing 5, hint of 3 at Höhepunkt) 
m.136: 2(3) (3 in diminished, off-beat form) 
m.145: 2 
m.149ff: 4+field drum 
155ff: 34 (and 4 introduces creeping chord in m.160) 
169f: 2 (in whole-tone neutralization) 
172f: 4 (as pickup to XXX)

Incipits: motives 1 through 4 are used as rhythmic incipits to other themes ...

I: VII, VIII, alpha, (X), XI, XIII, (XVI), XXIV-1, XXV, XXIV-3, XXX 
‘alpha complex’: alpha, cf. I, VII, XIII

II: V, XXV, XXX

III: XIII (pickup version), XXI (serial transformation), XXVIII, XXX

IV: XXIII-1 (m.91, m.107, m.149; very important in second half of piece).
TRANSITION (MM.25–38)—IN THREE PARTS

The change of character, texture, and tempo that occurs in m.25 marks the beginning of the Transition. The tempo is already faster than Tempo I and increases through Flottes Marschtempo II at m.33 to m.36, at which point it falls back to prepare for the much slower “Episode” at m.39 (to be discussed in our next section). The Transition divides into three parts: (1) mm.25–28, chordal-rhythmic; (2) mm.29–32, more melodic-thematic; and (3) mm.33–38, a combination of the two preceding parts. The whole passage from m.25 to m.39 is shown in Example 7.11 (over the next three pages).

Transition, part 1: chordal-rhythmic, mm.25–28

The first part of the Transition has a new chordal-rhythmic character and texture, beginning with the string spiccato ‘dive-bomber’ chords and the ‘repeat fire’ of the ensuing woodwind chords. (Analytical Example 7.11, like Berg’s Particell, does not reproduce the rhythmic surface animation of these initial chordal ideas that occurs in the full score.) The chords constitute thematic idea X (10); idea IX-1 in its eighth-note form accompanies, while its sixteenth-note variant (IX-2) serves as an anacrusis to idea XI (mm.27–28); the subdivision is terminated by the literally ‘cadential’ contour of idea XI.

Despite the sense of transition (or new departure), the thematic-level formal functions that begin in m.25 are in some respects clearer than those of the exposition and counter-exposition: this greater formal clarity is perhaps what led Adorno to describe the section as “the deceptive principal entrance of the March” (Adorno 1991, 83).” Specifically, the presentation of the basic idea (idea X; string chord plus woodwind chord) is one measure in length (m.25); its repetition (m.26) is continued in the fragmentation to two-beat units (m.27) and a further two-beat unit with added triplet fall-out (m.28) concludes (as cadential idea XI).
Example 7.11: Transition, mm.25–38—mm.25–30, analytical notes

Part 1

5-26 [012458]  5-14 [01237]  5-25 [02358]  7-30 [012468]

5-22 [01478]

Part 2

4-18 [0147]  6-17  7-20  8-8

012 wedge to C

idea VIII collaterally thickened with 0-8s

as at m.26ff

IX-2 altered
Example 7.11 [cont’d]: Transition, mm.25–38—mm.31–34, analytical notes
Example 7.11 [end]: Transition, mm.25–38—mm.35–39, analytical notes
(Comments on Ex.7.11, Transition Part 1, continued:)

This form-functional clarity at the opening of the Transition is seriously undermined by the puzzling complexities of its harmonic content. As Example 7.11 catalogues, the predominantly pentachordal to septachordal vertical collections of idea X and the tetrachordal succession of cadential idea XI display a dizzying variety of sonority. The "verticals" labeled between stafflines three and four of the Example are aligned below the chords to which they refer. For example, first chord of idea X (m.25) forms a representative of SC 6–31 [014579], becoming 7–30 [0124689] with the late addition of bass note D2. The woodwind chord in the second half of the measure is SC 5–26 [02458]; similarly, the repetition of the b.i. (m.26) shows SC 6–44 [012569], 7–17 [0124569] with the late addition of bass note G2, and woodwind chord 5–14 [01257]; though in this last case, a change in the bass note of the chord shifts us to SC 5–32 [01469] (as bass clarinet C3 yields to the Bb2 in horns idea IX-1). The continuation then shows the succession of vertical SCs 5–22, 4–16, 5–25, 4–14 and the cadential idea shows SCs 4–9, 4–28, 4–8 and 4–27, 4–3, 4–24.

This is a bewildering succession of sonorous variety. Even the usually successful analytical tactic that assesses Berg's more complex chords in terms of their trichordal (or tetrachordal) subsets proves of limited value. The first chord of X, for example, shows an upper quartal trichord (027, reading top-down: F#5–C#5–G#4) and a lower quintal trichord (also 027, once the somewhat independently functioning D2 arrives; reading bottom-up: D2–A2–E3), with a centrally-disposed 048 (E3–C4–G#4). Yet this implicit shift to quartal/quintal combinations and quasi-symmetrical chordal dispositions is not maintained in the subsequent chords. Similarly, in m.27, the apparent surface voice-leading combination of upward-moving parallel thirds in the tenor register and downward-moving parallel fourths in the alto register is too short-lived a phenomenon to bear much structural responsibility.
Indeed, the variety and density of pc-set content which characterizes idea X forces the listener to seek more primitive means of association.

Consider, for example, the contour of the top voice of idea X: if we construe the relative registral position of the four notes of the presentation of the basic idea and its repetition (mm.25–26) in contour space, we get: <30+21> (i.e., highest, lowest, next-to-highest, next-to-lowest) for F#5–D4–E5–F4. The continuation (m.27) shows a rhythmic compression of chord-pairs to quarter-note value, but the contour-pairs are reordered to become <21+30>; i.e., the move from apex to nadir that characterized the beginning of the presentation is shifted to the end of the continuation in order to provide impetus into cadential idea XI (m.28). As mentioned above, the cadential idea itself shows a literally ‘cadential’ contour: it falls from apex to nadir, <543+210>. Idea XI also features more familiar (and more audible) horizontal pc-set content in its upper voice: [014] as <A96> plus [016] as <A49>.

The chordal succession of mm.25–28 recurs, with some alterations, in the closing sections of the piece (mm.136–139); similarly, the complex chords of mm.37–38 return at m.140. This correspondence (originally discussed by DeVoto 1980, 103–104 and particularly 1984, 432–434) will be addressed when those later passages are discussed below. For now, before we move on to the next part of the Transition, it is important to acknowledge the role played by idea IX, which accompanies as Nebenstimme (horns) in m.26ff. The idea begins with a [013] trichord, as <9A0A9>, in (initially, triplet) eighth note values: this can be seen as the combination of a ‘smoothing-out’ of the dotted anacrusis rhythm and an intervallic compression (to 013) of the [014] trichord, the elements that together characterize motive I <78B> as well as idea alpha <787BA06>. As has been noted by DeVoto (1984, 414), the ‘major seventh’ tag to IX-1 (also built into IX-2) serves to associate that idea with motive II. The repetition of that fragment (see slurs on Example) then connects IX-1 to a
variant of idea 'V'; which, due to its initial Eb2 and 'minor seventh' leap (a
compromise between the immediately preceding 'major seventh' fragments
and the 'major sixth' that began idea V at its first appearance in m.5) produces
SC 5-11 [02347] rather than the familiar 5-37 [03458].

**Transition, part 2: melodic-thematic, mm.29–32**

Part 2 of the Transition is dominated by the presence of three distinct
melodic-thematic strata. The expressive interpolation for solo viola, idea XII,
is accompanied by idea VIII (clarinets and bassoons), the latter collaterally
thickened with augmented trichords (048s), while continuity from part 1 is
ensured by a literal repetition of underpinning bass-stratum idea IX-1 (again
continued as modified 'V'). Hauptstimme idea XII 'wedges' to C in m.30–31
and is replaced by idea XIII: the latter is derived from the dotted incipit of
motive I (and idea VIII, cf. at m.26) but is adjusted so that the characteristic
initial [014] trichord becomes [015] (i.e., the third pitch moves up, rather than
down, a semitone). This causes a contour inversion of the subsequent [016]
trichord (<-6, +11> versus <+6 -11> in VIII), at which point idea XIII
completely mutates from its idea-VIII pedigree and 'hangs up' on gapped
wholetone tetrachord, SC 4-25 [0268] formed from interlocking 026 trichords
(a sonority familiar from idea VI, m.8, though there with differing thematic
contour). Idea XIII eventually returns as the 'closing idea' of the first half of
the Marsch in the texture takeover of m.76ff.

Sneaking into the texture at m.30–31 and introduced by an altered
version of the IX-2 anacrusis, we find a new, "stripped-down," trichordal
presentation of X for trombones. Its continuation (for horns and harps, m.33)
is also introduced by the IX-2 anacrusis (at m.32, which, since it takes over
from idea VIII, is similarly thickened with 048s) and it is in this form that idea
X becomes the Hauptstimme of the texture at the beginning of Part 3.
Transition, part 3: combination of previous parts, mm.33–38

Part 3 of the transition, as we have just shown, is the continuation of ideas emerging in the nether strata of part 2. Yet other structural features justify its distinct status, particularly the presence of idea alpha. Alpha forms the violin Nebenstimme at m.33; an 048 arpeggiation then serves as anacrusis to a developed statement of the idea as a chaining of 014 trichords (for clarinets, oboes, and eventually flutes) as one of two coincidental Hauptstimmen in m.35ff. The other Hauptstimme is a T1 transposition of the continuation of X (cf. m.33 and m.35). The texture (at m.35) is further complicated by leftover fragments of XI's triplet fall-out. The transpositional relation is underscored by the sequential handling of fragments of idea V in the bass stratum: the figure (from G2) in m.33 (itself T4 of the incipit of the V fragment in the preceding measure) is subjected to two T7 ("cycle of fifths") transpositions; the whole pattern is repeated T1 (from Ab2) in mm.35–36.

This phrase-level T1 transpositional schema is the result of an insert into the Particell. The dotted brackets enclosing portions of mm.34–35 in Example 7.11 indicate that Berg (on folio 19v of the Particell) 'ballooned' the contents of these two measures onto a separate system (between the existing two systems) because he had no more room at the end of the page. (This of course implies that folio 20 was already begun.) Though it is not possible to reconstruct completely the events that led to this insert, a comparison of Particell entries with the score suggests that the core of the texture originally connected Hauptstimme idea X (m.33; last measure of folio 19v) directly to idea XI (m.36, first measure of folio 20). When, however, Berg decided to add idea alpha (at m.33) and its development (mm.35–37), he perhaps felt the need to approach the climactic statement of cadential idea XI (m.36, from C6) in stages. The solution was the sequential transpositional schema (essentially m.35f=T1[m.33f]) that affected the bass stratum, as well as ideas X and XI.
This "delaying tactic" was, I believe, undertaken principally so that the development of motive alpha (mm.35–37) could take place. Note that the original alpha already ends with tritone C6–F#5 (m.34) and would, thus, have connected quite smoothly to the climactic statement of XI in m.36. However, the idea for a development of alpha went back to the page 17 of sketchbook Berg 13/ii, which is transcribed in Example 7.12 (on the next page). Though placed between the two sketches for the Counter-Exposition (pages 16 and 18, transcribed above) the contents of sketchbook page 17 concern this moment in the Transition.

Sketches for the Transition, particularly for its complex and variegated chordal streams (ideas X and XI), are noticeably absent from the sketchbook. The beginning of Ex.7.12 intimates the switch to chordal texture that characterizes the section (accurately numbered m."25" in the sketch); also, at sketched m."28", an insertion of chords ("Akk[orde]") is suggested. However, the one chord present in the sketch bears little resemblance to the Transition chords (though its sonority is familiar enough from the other two pieces of Opus 6—SC 5–21 [01458] as <72A6+B6A>, a combination of tetrachord 4–19 [0148] and trichord [014]; recall, too, my suggestion of a structural projection of G4–D4–Bb3–F#3 <72A6> in the upper voice at the end of the Exposition!).

In general, the measure numbers on this sketch cannot be sequentially reconciled with those of the score. The rhythm of idea IX is present in sketched measures "26" and "27" in both eighth-note and sixteenth-note value variants. Given the contents of the surrounding pages, one might guess that these entries actually refer to the end of the Counter-Exposition (m.24), but the textural pattern matches more closely the accompaniment figures in the Transition, specifically mm.29–30 (double bass).
Example 7.12: Transcription of Berg 13/ii, page 17, sketch for transition ideas

Notes:
page variously scrawled out
1 chord faint, smudged
2 possibly Bb
3 faint entry
4 scribble out, D♭ [?]
5 asterisk cross-reference to Episode sketch, p.27
In a similar manner, the development of alpha found on line 7 of the sketch, and designated measure "29", takes the shape found only in part 3 of the Transition (m.35ff, oboes and clarinets, "sehr ausdrucksvoll"); as shown on the last page of analytical Example 7.11). The asterisk (*) at the end of the sketch in Ex.7.12 is a cross-reference to the "Episode" (m.39ff) which follows the Transition, and which is sketched on page 27 of Berg 13/ii. We will examine a transcription of that Episode sketch shortly, but note for now that the 026 motive (G5–F4–G5–C#5) found in m.37 of the score (again see Ex.7.11), which was "due" at the end of the sketch transcribed in Ex.7.12, occurs at the beginning of the Episode sketch: thus, the motivic correspondence between m.37 and m.39 is explicit in the sketches, where the motives are juxtaposed. They occur slightly farther apart in the score because m.38 is another 'ballooned insert' into the Particell.

This 'insert' is marked by dotted brackets in Example 7.11. As was the case with the previous Particell insert, it is not possible to reconstruct entirely the events which led to this change. For example, it is not clear whether the fragmentary triplet chords of idea XI in latter part of m.37 originally proceeded directly to the Episode, or whether they were one of the main causes of the need for the insertion which is now m.38. Berg perhaps felt that more time was required to dissipate the climax of m.36 and to slow the tempo for the beginning of the Episode. In this context, it is interesting to observe the consistency of set-class structure in the harmonies across the insertion. The beginning and ending chords of m.37 (the "bottomings-out" the idea-XI triplets) feature SC 5–31 [01369]. Similarly, tetrachordal subset 4–18 [0147] is not only contained in these chords, it is also found in the "cross-border harmonies" that connect Transition to Episode (mm.38–39). The complete section-connecting progression involves Z-related pentachords (5–38 [01258] to 5–18 [01457]). The allusive tonal character of these harmonies is further
enhanced by the quasi dominant ("V") quality of the penultimate chord, and by smooth voice-leading between chords: down by semitone in the upper parts, while the bass rises a fourth, A2–D3. Though the tonal drive towards D is somewhat undermined by the presence of the G–C–Eb component at the beginning of m.39, the D–A fourth contained in the initial idea of the Episode helps confirm the allusion.

**FORMAL SKETCHES**

Though the general layout of Berg 13/ii was discussed in Chapter 3, it is appropriate—before we turn to a discussion of the Episode—to review here that a break occurs at sketchbook page 24, which is blank. Following the Counter-Exposition/Transition sketches on pp.16–18, we find 'first runs' at sketches for Middle-Section elements: page 19, "C3", motive IX-1 in the form of m.46ff; page 20, "D", motive XIII in the form of m.72/76ff; page 21, "C4", motive II, in the Flottes Marschtempo form of m.53ff; and also, on pages 21–23, the first tentative versions of ideas for the Retransition—the dénouement and chordal descent of motive XXII and the dyadic (Eb–Db) 'Wozzeck'-quotation' rumblings, the latter clearly designated "E" in the sketchbook (p.22). These sketches will be discussed in conjunction with their appropriate sections below. The principal sketch for the next section of the Marsch—the "Episode" (mm.39–46) which immediately follows the Transition—does not occur until page 27 of Berg 13/ii. The two immediately preceding pages contain concept sketches for the overall formal design of the first half of the piece. These are provided in facsimile in Example 7.13(a)(b) and are transcribed in Example 7.14(a)(b) (over the next four pages).
Example 7.14(a): Transcription of Berg 13/ii, page 25, Formal Sketches (p.1 of 2)

Notes:  
1. page crossed out  
2. "Episode" rhythm, notes unclear  
3. words difficult to decipher ("entwickeln" probable; "Sturm" [?])
Example 7.14(b): Transcription of Berg 13/ii, page 26, Formal Sketches (p.2 of 2)

Notes:  
1 page stroked through  
2 faint stick at beginning of measure
The layout of information on sketchbook page 25, when combined with the alphabetic labeling of some of the ideas found on the preceding pages, suggests that Berg’s conception of the form was as follows: Exposition (mm.1-14), “Aa”; Counter-Exposition (mm.15-24) “b” [recall “Gruppe B”] “(ausspinnen)”, an “Episode” (m.39ff), and a section “C” that consists of various ideas numbered 1 through 4 (“C3” being m.46ff) and moves to “D” (idea XIII, e.g., m.76ff) and “E” (m.79ff), followed by a general crescendo based on idea “A6”. Note that the musical idea sketched on line 9 is “delta-2”, which forms the tail of “E” at m.83, and that the ostinato-crescendo passage in m.84ff is indeed based on overlapping statements of idea “VI” (recall the discussion of the label “A6” in my transcription of sketchbook page 14, Example 7.8(a), above).

The musical entries on page 25 show the ‘spinning-out’ (“ausspinnen”) of idea alpha (lines 1 and 2), the initial role of idea IX-1 as a terminating tag and interpolation into alpha (line 3), and the motivic correspondence between the end of alpha and the beginning of the “Episode” (note the bracket at the end of line 2, and the vertical alignment of ideas at the beginnings of lines 2 and 5). Alphabetic labels “C1” and “C2” are not assigned to specific musical material in the sketches. However, since the sketched idea labelled “C3” is clearly idea IX-1—which occurs briefly at the end of the counter-exposition (m.24), then again in the Transition (m.25 and m.29), before it serves as the main idea of the middle section proper (m.46)—it seems reasonable to assume that “C1” and “C2” refer to earlier appearances of this idea. Perhaps “C2” also refers to the diminished version of idea IX-1: because it is that sixteenth-note variant (IX-2, m.50ff) which does develop into “C4” [“C2 entwickeln zu C4”]: the “Trillertheme” expansion of motive II at the Flottes Marschtempo (m.53ff) and, again, the trilling fragments of II just before idea “D” takes over the texture (m.70ff).
The second page of these formal notes, shown in facsimile and transcription in Examples 7.13(b) and 7.14(h), is less informative. It refers to a "middle section" and comments on the rhythmic character of the "transition". "Trillertheme" is a label for motive 2, specifically for its development that occurs at m.53ff. Ideas in musical notation in this sketch are few in number: opening motives "1" and "4", and (on line 6 and the comments below it) important interjection idea XVIII. Idea XVIII first appears in m.56, and, as the sketch indicates, is enhanced by Tamtam and passed from trombone through horn (m.59; to the big chords in mm.60–61).

The next page of the sketchbook (p.27) details the Episode.

**EPISODE, MM.39–46**

The Episode sketch found on page 27 of sketchbook 13/ii is presented in facsimile in Example 7.15—mostly for the purpose of capturing Berg's cute doodles (mice?) on the right side of the page!—and is transcribed in Example 7.16. As described above in our discussion of the Transition (Ex.7.11), Berg's asterisk (*) at the beginning of this sketch links it to the end of the sketch on p.17 (Ex.7.12). The 026 motive (G5–F4–G5–C#5, 〈7571〉; 〈157〉) that occurs at the end of the Transition is seen at the beginning of this sketch (m."31", recte m.37), where it serves to link into the principal idea of the Episode in the following measure (m."32", recte m.39): trichord 026 (as 〈268〉) is embedded in SC 4–29 [0137] as 〈G#4–F#4–D5–A4〉. (Recall that m.38 is an insertion into the Particell; the 026 association was originally more proximate, as this sketch shows.) Many of the leading ideas of the Episode are represented with fair accuracy in the sketch. A more detailed analysis of the Episode is provided in Example 7.17.
Notes:  
① segment likely in treble clef; asterisk [*] cf. to p.17  
② lower voice crossed out  
③ segment overwrites staff 7
Example 7.17: Episode, mm.39-46—mm.39-42, analytical notes
Example 7.17: Episode, mm.39-46—mm.43-46, analytical notes
Comments on Example 7.17, Episode: The leading basic idea (b.i.) of the Episode (DeVoto's theme XV-1) subdivides into two motives: the initial \(<68629\) features a 026 trichord inside as instance of SC 4–Z29 \([0137]\); its answering \(<454A\) features a 016 trichord with an important concluding tritone drop, E4–Bb3. Both motives are 'D-centred', a situation reinforced by the bass D3. At the broadest level, the opening bass motion D3–B3–Bb3 (m.39) might be understood to recur in enlargement: B2 (m.39–40), Bb2 (m.41), then C2 and C3 introducing B2 (m.41–43); the whole motion is then summarized in the terminating delta-2 statement of mm.45–46 (D3 moving chromatically to B2 and Bb2 before the tritone drop to E2).

The contrasting idea (c.i.), not separately accounted for in DeVoto's Table, continues the 'D-centricity' of the b.i. with a 048 (A–C#–F) arpeggiation to dyad Bb–Ab5. The c.i. is accompanied by a statement of idea XII (solo cello): the pitch classes of its initial 026 trichord are derived from those the bass motive (to rhythm IV); the remainder of XII also features 026s and is closely co-ordinated with the trichordal harmonies of the bass flurry of motive IX.2. (Incidentally, the initial tetrachord of motive XII is a representation of SC 4–15, the Z-related alternative all-interval chord to Episode b.i. 4–29.)

A revised b.i.-c.i. pairing follows in mm.41–42. The b.i. (XV-2, as DeVoto's Table has shown) is a loose inversion of components from its prototype: the initial Bb5–Ab5 dyad and 024 trichords are a 'link' from the preceding c.i.. A new c.i. then follows: a chain of dyads connecting F4 to E4, quasi-cadential in character. The bass motive (m.42) contributes to the local sense of caesura by composing a rhythmic retard, again beginning from rhythm IV. (Incidentally, and briefly, the vertical sonority at the beginning of m.42 instances the same SC 5–18 \([01457]\) as occurs in the Episode's opening vertical.)
Together, the b.i.-c.i. pairs of mm.39–40 and 41–42 effect the Episode's 'presentation function'. A 'continuation' ensues in mm.43–44, as the upward arpeggiation contour of the c.i. is subjected to developmental extension. Its c.i. derivation is corroborated by the recurrence of idea XII (solo double bass) as counterpoint. The upward flurry of idea IX-2 also recurs in the bass register (compare mm.40 and 44), though its pitch-class and (trichordal) set-class content is less consistent than before, and the texture is considerably thickened by the simultaneous downward flurry of idea XIV. (Once again, Berg had to balloon these flurries above and below the main staff in his Particell; F 21 Berg 12, fol. 20v.) The upper-register melodic figure of the continuation ends with dyad C#6–B5 (T3 of the original c.i.). This dyad then becomes a link to the third variant of idea XV (XV-3, m.44), its form-functional role now transformed from presentational to continuation=> cadential, with terminating tritone drop G5–C#5 (T3 of the Bb–E tritone at the end of the original b.i.).

At this juncture, several ideas conspire to close off the Episode: flurry IX-2 terminates with the delta-2 tag (here as F5–E–Eb–G) and idea XII (double bass) overlaps a complete statement of delta-2 (horn). The latter should close with an upward-rising third, F#4–A#4 (cf. the final D–F# in the original delta-2 statement, mm.7–8, violins and flutes). However, the 'due' A#4 does not occur; instead, a statement of delta-1 (trombone 3 and harp) begins from A#3 and serves to conclude the whole section. This terminating role of delta-1—familiar from the Präludium and Reigen—is here complemented by the upper line (clarinets; mm.45–46), which incorporates the 'tail' of idea VI (clarinets; cf. horn mm.11–12). Thus, the thematic ideas of the "Melodie" near the beginning of the Marsch—delta-2 and VI—return at this point—as delta-2 tag, tail of VI, and delta-1—with a 'structural framing' function, that closes off not only the local Episode but also the whole front end of the piece.
Before we move on to the Middle Section of the Marsch, it is helpful to revisit the layout of sketchbook 13/ii, in order to survey how the sketches for the various ideas in that section are disposed. Figure 7.6 summarizes the disposition of sketches for pages 19 through 49 of the sketchbook.

Figure 7.6: Disposition of sketches for Middle Section (and other) ideas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ideas</th>
<th>Pages in sketchbook 13/ii:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Formal sketches</td>
<td>125, 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Episode</td>
<td>127, 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle section</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>19, 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[XX, XXI]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E (Wozzeck)</td>
<td>22, 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[blank pages]</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recapitulatory materials?</td>
<td>[35]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Reigen “Walzer” leaf]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the discussion of Formal Sketches (p.416, above), the Middle-Section ideas Berg labeled ‘C’ (pp.19, 21), ‘D’ (p.20), and ‘E’ (pp.22–23) were briefly described. (Sketches for the Middle Section will be examined in detail below.) Two blank pages (p.24 and p.35) provide the sketchbook with natural subdivisions (indicated by the dashed vertical lines on Fig.7.6). The “formal sketches” found on pp.25–26 are followed by the Episode sketches (pp.27–28). The next sketches return to further workings of middle ideas ‘D’ (pp.29 and 31), ‘C’ (pp.30–32), and, again, ‘D’ (p.33–34). Page 34—perhaps in momentary frustration?—contains only the sixteenth-note rhythmic incipit of idea ‘D’.

Following blank page 35, page 36 begins as if to break new ground. The top of the page is marked “C Dur” and “III Th[eil]”. However, the musical contents of the page’s two two-line systems show the contour of the grazioso idea incipit (XX, m.62ff; on sketch line 2) over a fragment of motive II (line 3), and the rhythm of textural-takeover idea ‘D’ (XIII; sketch line 5) with a
counterpointed motive (ostensibly in C major-minor)—Ab5–G5–C6–B5 (not used)—laid above. It is not clear from this sketch what Berg construed as the "III Theil". Page 37 shows an experiment with a canonic working of a rhythmically-square variant of Episode idea XV-1 at unison, at two beats lag. The scrawled annotations on the sketch probably read "aus verzögern" (i.e., "lagging out") and "Canon". (My first transcription attempt posited "aus vergangenes" and "cresc."[?], respectively, for these annotations; and I therefore thought that Berg might have intended this 'D-centred' Episode idea as an allusion to Schoenberg's op.16, no.2: "Vergangenes". Further reflection on both the transcription and the relation between the two passages has cast doubt on this line of inquiry. The sketch on page 37 is, otherwise, of limited interest [so inclusion of a transcription was felt unnecessary]: the canonic working of idea XV does not occur in the piece.

Pages 38 and 39 again return to further workings of Middle-Section ideas 'C' and 'E'. These sketches overlay tentative (and incorrect) measure numbers for the move to Particell; their contents will be discussed with the appropriate subsections below. Sketchbook pages 40 through 43 represent another change of tack: for the most part, they show experiments with projected recapitulatory materials. The main contents of page 40 correspond to ideas at m.128ff and m.136ff of the score; transcription and commentary is deferred until those passages are discussed. For now, we note that the bottom of page 40 projects a substantial recapitulation of material from the exposition—"vom Anfang" "20 Takte"—with bass idea VII (m.9ff) leading to theme VIII (m.11ff). The latter theme is continued on sketchbook page 41 (line 1), where its climactic G#5 (cf. m.12, b.4) is marked "lange" "etc". The rest of page 41 concerns the rhythmic combination of Middle-Section ideas XIII ('D') and XVIII (such as briefly occurs in mm.68–69 of the score). Page 42 projects another "Episode"—not used—that was to be based on an
"abwärtssteigend[e] / Figur aus Mitteltheil"—not found. Page 43 continues a rhythmic contour sketch (in triplets, sixteenths, and eighths) from the bottom of page 42. Assigning these sketched ideas to specific passages in the score is not feasible; that their intention was recapitulatory, and that section “III” perhaps concerned a projected recapitulation is shown by the “III” at the top left (line 2) of page 43 and by the comment at the right (lines 4–6): “halber Takt ∞”; and, boxed, “III Baß von Takt 9, 10 / wiederholen”. This again projects a recapitulation of bass idea VII (mm.9–10): such a recapitulation does not occur in the score.

Page 44 returns once more to Middle-Section ideas; specifically, it shows the rhythmic contours of interjection idea XVIII (mm.56 and 59). Page 45 continues with the characteristic inversionally-related rhythmic contours of the grazioso theme’s basic idea and its repetition (theme XX, m.62ff). And the ‘big tune’ (theme XXI, m.66ff) is worked out on page 46. (All of these sketches are transcribed and discussed below). Page 47 of the sketchbook, the reader will recall, is the inserted (glued-in) “Walzer”-sketch leaf, which we transcribed in conjunction with Reigen (Ex.5.13, p.277). The top of the verso side of the leaf (page 48) does contain grazioso-like rhythmic fragments, though the remaining contents of the page—which was transplanted from the Stadtbibliothek sketchbook—are not otherwise assignable.

Finally, page 49—which is integral to sketchbook 13/ii, and which is the last page of Marsch sketches before the Wozzeck half of the sketchbook begins—contains rhythmic contour sketches for Middle-Section ideas ‘D’ (texture takeover idea XIII, cf. mm.72ff and 76ff) and ‘E’ (top of the page, in the form of chordal descent idea XXII, end of m.77ff). Remarkably, in the score this latter idea—only tentatively expressed in the sketch—leads directly to what is now commonly known as the Wozzeck-quotation (mm.79–83 cf. Wozzeck I/2, mm.274–278). (The sketch will be transcribed below.)
We now turn to a discussion of the Middle Section of the Marsch. The section has a number of subdivisions: mm.46–52 (middle section proper). 53–62 (Flottes Marschtempo regained), 62–66 (grazioso), and 66–71 ('big tune'). The passages at mm.71–75 and 76–78 (Etwas breiter) effect the texture-takeover by idea XIII; as such, they represent the termination of the Middle Section and the culmination of the entire first half of the Marsch. The two passages that then follow serve both as first-half closing idea and as transition to the second half: mm.79–83, chordal dénouement figure XXII and the crescendo-accelerando 'Wozzeck quotation'; and mm.84–90, a second crescendo-accelerando orchestral block based on idea VI.

**Middle Section proper ('C3'), mm.46–52**

Once the delta-1 (trombone and harp) Nebenstimme figure bottoms out with the tritone (Bb2–E2) drop to pedal tone E (m.46), the listener feels a true contrasting middle section of the Marsch has begun. At the same time, however, the tempo markings (Ins tempo I zurückkehrend ... and vorwärts!) indicate that the passage is already in transition. Tempo I is regained in m.50 and the acceleration continues into the beginning of the next subsection, m.53ff. The passage is also bound together, and bridged into the next subsection, by the continuing presence of the tritone 'border tones' (Bb and E): the double basses—to the rhythm of motive III as T° I is regained—fill the space in a chromatic creep from E2 in m.50 (continuing the harp pedal tone) down to Bb1 in m.56.

The principal ideas of mm.46–52 are: the delta-1 tag as Nebenstimme (bassoon), which is gradually transformed into IX-2 (clarinet and oboe); and the presentation of IX-1 as Hauptstimme (viola), to which—with the regaining of T° I—the motive II trill is appended (m.50, violin). In its
continuation (trumpet, m.50), this transformation of II also gives rise to brief idea XVI (violins, m.52).

Idea XVI (as identified in DeVoto’s Table) recurs but once (buried in m.139). The idea can be derived from a registral manipulation of the delta-1 tag: \(<7652> SC 4-4 [0125]\). Its initial rising seventh contour establishes commonality with both motive II and idea V. (XVI could therefore be incorporated into DeVoto’s “later adventures of II”; 1984:412–419, specifically, between his Examples 5 and 6 on p.415). The beginning of XVI picks up the concluding vertical tetrachord \(<4827>, SC 4-15 [0146]\) of the trumpets’ measured trill; its end tacks on an upward chromatic figure: \(<234> [012]\) (pizz.). This punchy gesture immediately transforms the incipit of Nebenstimme idea IX-2 (cello, m.52ff) from its usual \([013]\) contour to chromatic \([012]\). In less punchy form, such a ‘chromatic creep’ has been anticipated in the collateral parts to IX-1 (viola and violin, mm.49–50) and it also underlies the new warbling horns Hauptstimme that takes over at m.53: \(<BA~9, 87~6, 32~1> ('~' indicates the warbles).

Sketches for this first Middle Section subsection are found in Berg 13/ii on pages 19, 28, 30, 32 and 39. Page 19 twice shows the incipit of idea IX-1 (at pitch: G3–Ab–Bb–Ab–variable upward leap): in the first instance (p.19, line 1) the trill figure of motive II is appended; in the second instance (p.19, line 7) the shape of idea V is appended. Both of these experiments in continuations for IX-1 are given “C3” formal labels. The sketches on pages 28 and 30 also show IX-1—its final major-seventh upward leap now defined—with appended motives II (p.28, l.8; p.30, l.6) and V (p.30, l.7; in trial combination with motive II). The attachment of motive V to IX-1 does not occur directly in this subsection in the score (though such an attachment will be recalled from the Transition, mm.30–35, bass). I have, however, just argued that idea XVI (derived from the delta-1 tag), which occurs at this point in the score
(m.52), establishes a kind of synthesis of motives II and V—as predicted in these sketches. Sketchbook page 28 (top, lines 3 and 2, cross-staff) also shows most of the pitch string and triplet rhythm of the ‘tail’ of theme VI, a figure that closes out the clarinet Hauptstimme of the Episode (m.45–46). The figure is unmistakable in the sketch, though it lacks certain rhythmic subtleties and is metrically displaced by half a measure. A comparison of sketch and score versions is provided in Example 7.18. Ex.7.18(a) shows the ‘tail’—the bracket marker is Berg’s—as first sketched (13/ii, p.15, line 4; see also Exx.7.7–7.8, above); Ex.7.18(b) shows the ‘tail’ as it first occurs in the score (horns, m.11). Ex.7.18(c) excerpts the sketch for the end of the Episode and the beginning of the Middle Section (Berg 13/ii, p.28, lines 2–3); finally, Ex.7.18(d) shows this passage as found in the score (clarinets, yielding to violas, m.45ff).

Example 7.18: the ‘tail’ of theme VI in sketch and score

(a) sketch, 13/ii, p.15, line 4

(b) score, m.11, horns 1 & 2

(c) sketch, 13/ii, p.28, lines 2–3

(d) score, m.45, clarinets

end of Episode
beginning of Middle Section
Example 7.19: Transcription of Berg 13/ii, page 32, sketch for m.46ff

Notes:

1. page crossed out
2. faint upper part; lower part overtraced in purple pencil
3. extremely faint entries
4. C# beam scribbled out
5. measure numbers overwritten
6. passages scribbled out but decipherable; line 8, beginning of line 9, and line 10 overtraced in purple pencil
The most fully textured sketch for this subsection is found on page 32; it is transcribed in Example 7.19 (see previous page). The entire sketch is heavily smudged. The lower voice of line 3 and the entries on lines 8, 9 (beginning), and 10 are written (or overwritten) in purple pencil. Berg’s measure numbers (‘m.39’ etc.) in the sketch are inaccurate; the beginning of the sketch corresponds to m.46 of the score. The pairing of Haupt- and Nebenstimme motives is largely intact. However, the initial three measures are metrically displaced by half a measure (as was the sketch for the Episode-ending motive VI tag on p.28). In the score, the pattern—which combines the delta-1 tag and Hauptstimme idea IX-1—emerges from the beat 3 reiterations of harp pedal note E2 (absent from the sketch).

The metrical adjustment was made only at the Particell stage: because the delta-1 tag at the end of the Episode drops to E2 on beat 3, the patterns found in the sketch are adjusted in Particell (and score) to begin from that beat. But Berg still wanted the motive II trill figures to fall on the downbeat (as in the sketch, first two measures on line 6; and in the score, mm.50 and 51). This meant that half a measure had to be omitted or somehow compressed. Berg accomplished this by making the third statement of IX-1 follow immediately upon the second one, with no rest in between. The “gr Terz” [major third] indication in the sketch (line 2) accounts for the doubling in the second statement (and the third one), in Particell and score, at the major third below. The evidence of the metrical adjustment is observable in the Particell: Berg ballooned beats 3 and 4 of m.48 above the system, and placed the third statement of the motive there.

Finally, the central portion (lines 3–8) of page 39 of sketchbook 13/ii shows the general rhythmic contour (inexact) of the Nebenstimme of this subsection (bassoons etc., mm.49ff). This idea is the continuation of the delta-1 tag (m.46ff), a variant of IX-2 which forms the proper counterpoint (absent
from the p.32 sketch) to string Hauptstimme IX-1. Though the p.39 sketch is inexact, it has a number of details worthy of mention (if not complete transcription and commentary). The downbeat of the Nebenstimme figure in the sketch (corresponding to m.50 in the score) introduces the rhythmic contour of idea XII as a counterpoint: in the score, XII does not occur; it is replaced with the continuing development of idea IX-1 in the Hauptstimme, plus the entry of the basses with rhythmic motive III—like XII, a rather metrically square idea—which eventually culminates at mm.60–61. In the sketch, the Nebenstimme idea terminates with the contour of cadential idea XI (sketch line 4) followed immediately by the motive II tremolo (line 7, beats 2–3). In the score, the incorporation of the motive II tremolo is restricted to the Hauptstimme and is always placed on the downbeat, where it eventually develops into the warbling horn figure of m.53ff—recall the discussion of metrical adjustment in our preceding paragraph. Sketched cadential idea XI also fails to appear at this point in the score (m.52); however, its vestiges may be recognized in the only-slightly-later and rhythmically smoother continuation of IX-2 found at m.54f (violins).

Overall, the musical documents for this subsection again emphasize that Berg’s effect in these sketches—and probably his (at least intuitive) purpose—was to explore the potential developmental continuation (the sequential juxtaposition) and possible contrapuntal combination (the vertical superposition) of his ideas without specific regard to (or knowledge of) their precise pitch contents: the sketches prove of greatest value as a means of understanding this stage, and aspect, of Berg’s compositional process.
Middle Section cont'd ('C4'), *Flottes Marschtempo (II)*, mm.53–62

The principal ideas of this subsection are: the lead-off Hauptstimme of warbling horns (m.53f), based on trill-motive II and fused directly to idea XVII (m.54–55); and the interjection idea XVIII (m.56), which gives rise to sixteenth-note figure XIX (m.57). Second appearances of ideas II and XVIII then culminate in parallel 'tutti' chords (to rhythmic motive III) which are coupled with a three-part imitative and quasi-cadential-functioning flurry of XIXs (mm.60–62). These ideas are briefly summarized in Example 7.20:

Example 7.20: principal ideas of mm.53–62
The warbling horns idea Ex.7.20(a) is based on trill-motive II and begins with a registrally-manipulated chromatic descent: \(<BA-9 87-6 32-1 A>\).
The break between pcs 6 and 3 results in linked [014]s (632 and 21A), or SC 5–37 [03458], familiar as the interjection idea of Präludium mm.11–13 and its Marsch derivative, idea V, which concludes with the delta-1 tag \(<3 21A>\) (SC 4–4 [0125]). The horns' warble is fused directly to idea XVII, which, like XVI (m.52), recurs but once (in augmentation at m.147–148). Idea XVII (m.54–55) expresses the pc string \(<7 5380 456>\). A clue to the possible derivation of this frisky newcomer may be found in the 014s of the preceding horn warbles: perhaps XVII intends a registral partitioning of 014s—top \(<5 8 4>\) and bottom \(<3 0 4>\). (Such a partitioning scheme is supported by Berg's orchestrational doublings in flutes and third trombone.) The final chromatic punch is (as DeVoto has noted) a repeat (a minor seventh lower) of the tag at the end of XVI (m.52). The earlier instance, \(<234>\), gave rise to a varied [012]-beginning to Nebenstimme IX-2 (cellos, m.52–53). The latter one, \(<456>\), is closely imitated by \(<789>\) (in bass clarinet and bassoon, m.55); together these 012s become part of the accompaniment to interjection idea XVIII.

Interjection XVIII (m.56), Ex.7.20(b) is initiated at the bottom of the bass chromatic creep (to the rhythm of motive III) through tritone E–Bb from E2 (m.50) to Bb1 (m.56). The idea, which begins \(<A5B>\) and splits into upper and lower parts, \(<723>\) and \(<6AB>\) respectively, amalgamates 016 and 014 trichords: \(<A5B>\) and, with parts interwoven, \(<67A>\) and \(<B23>\). The listener may have remarked that the beginning of XVIII (\(<A5B7>\)) seems akin (at the very least in contour) to cyclic idea beta; in fact, the two gestures share the same interval content as they are representatives of the two Z-related all-interval tetrachords. A comparison of the beginning of XVIII as found here in the Marsch with the upper voice of beta as it first occurs in Präludium m.37 in instructive: XVIII \(<A5B7>4–15 [0146], and beta \(<5B47>4–29 [0137]; aside
from their (probably incidental) sharing of three common pcs, the identity of
intervallic content—though not the result of any mechanical derivation—is
aurally quite evident when the gestures are juxtaposed.

Accompanying ideas. Aside from rhythmic motive III, the most
important accompanying idea in this subsection is a derivative of IX-2 (cellos,
mm.52–53): it begins with pc string <678 106 5>. Initially, the idea consists of
a 012 trichord followed by interlocking 016s. As mentioned earlier, the figure
begins with a 012 trichord (rather than the normal 013 incipit of IX-2, cf. m.27
and m.50) due to the force of the 012 tag at the end of the immediately
preceding idea XVI. The accompanying figure continues in the violins,
mm.54–55, with a different profile based (as DeVoto has noted, 1984:397) on
the end fragments of IX-2 from mm.51–52; but the figure also invokes, in a
smoother contour, the rhythm of cadential idea XI (recall the discussion of its
presence on sketchbook page 33, above). The end of this Nebenstimme settles
on trichord 014, as <32B>, embedded in a quintuplet rhythm, which forms—
with the 012 leftovers of XVII noted above (<456> and <789>) and rhythm III
(bottomed-out on Bb1)—the rumbling accompaniment to interjection XVIII.

XIX. It is perhaps this accompanimental 014 as <32B>, in conjunction
with the dyad <23> (over <AB>) at the top of XVIII, that gives rise to the first
statement of Hauptstimme idea XIX in m.57: it begins with a 014 and pcs 2
and 3, as <236> (over <AB2>). Following this explicit link, the complete pc
string of XIX is: <236 5310 420B>. The final two tetrachords of this string are
both representatives of SC 4–11 [0135] (the second T-1 of the first, with
displacement down an octave in the score).

Vertical considerations. Harmonically, one’s attention is drawn to
several significant verticalities; firstly, the quartal sonorities under the horn
warbles: SC 4–23 [0257] as <705A> (m.53, beat 1) and (T-3) <4927> (m.53, beat
3). These lead us to expect <B492> (i.e., a further T-5, parallelising the tune) on
the downbeat of m.54, but the verticality there is <B0 5A 2> (SC 5–36 [01247]);
the expected <B 4 9 2> may perhaps, however, be heard as the core contents of
the next downbeat (m.55) as <B 4(56) (78)9 2>. The chord at the very
beginning of m.56 (marking the entry of interjection XVIII) is <AB48>, a
representative of SC 4–29 [0137]; though its presence is very brief, this
verticality ably assists the horizontal statement of Z-related SC 4–15 [0146] as
<A5B7> that begins XVIII itself.

(In passing, we might note that the total pc content of the two voices of
idea XVIII instances SC 7–21 [0124589] [AB23567]; this SC then recurs as the
main verticality at the climactic Etwa breiter, m.76ff [4589B01]; that section is
discussed in more detail below. Given, however, the very different
disposition of these two abstractly T-6 related collections, it is doubtful that
their set-class ‘identity’ is compositionally significant, or particularly audible.)

Other striking verticalities in the latter part of the subsection include:
SC 4–19 [0148] as <5918> on four timpani in m.57; SC 6–21 [023468] as <71B 4
35B>, the vertical at the beginning of m.59; and, of course, the massive
parallel chords in mm.60–61. The timpani 4–19 is anticipated in beat three of
the preceding measure, where the ongoing rotation of trichordal leftovers
effects 4–19 as <A376>. The 6–21 is partitioned into two 026s with pc4 (the
first note of XVIII) in the middle (see listing above). The trilling upper
trichord <35B> of this hexachordal collection combines with low-register
passing G2 on the last sixteenth of m.59 to produce wt1 tetrachordal
subcollection 4–24 [0246] as <375 35B>.

The tutti chords at mm.60–61 instance SC 6–34 [013579] (incidentally,“Scriabin’s mystic chord”) as the extraordinarily-spaced <264809> (D2–F#2–
E3–G#4–C6–A6), followed by its direct T1 and T2 parallel transpositions,
<37591A> and <486A2B> (as shown in Ex.7.20(c)). Note that the five lowest
pitches in each verticality belong to one whole-tone subcollection (all, of
course, instance SC 5-33 [02468]); only the extreme highest pitch in each chord lies outside. The chords interact intriguingly with the Hauptstimme. In m.60, the two leftover rising chromatic snaps (<B0> and <12>) that fly out of the top of restated XVIII (m.59) can be extracted from dyads in the chordal motion connecting m.59–60 (<B0>, violins 1 to 2) and m.60–61 (<12>, oboe, trumpet, and harp), respectively. Similarly, the three freely imitative statements of variants of XIX that flurry about the chords in mm.60–61 begin from the <12> snap (as <126 41837, 128 5B5 21BA 9>) and continue with pc incipits extracted from the chords: <45B 829 7A52 9> (m.59–60) and, finally, <67 9>.

It will be noted that all three statements of XIX move to pc9 (on beat 3 of m.61); a final approach to the cadential point on beat 2 of m.62 then follows. The passage combines a chromatic descent from A3–Eb3 with reiterations of [014] as off-beat sixteenth note trichord <3B2>. When unison F3 is reached on the downbeat of m.62, the voices quickly cadence in the following progression of stacked trichords: <3B2> over <5> (4–12 [0236]); then <2A6> and <917> over <4> (4–24 [0248] and 4–27 [0258]); finally, to <7A2> over <3> (i.e., a ‘major-seventh chord’ type, SC 4–20 [0158]) at the cadence point.

Sketches relevant to this subsection are found in sketchbook 13/ii on pages 21, 26, 31, 33, and 44. Page 21 shows the derivation of the opening idea of the subsection (m.53f) from motive II, specifically the idea’s use of successive statements of the motive with eighth-note pickups leading to downbeat trill figures. The passage is marked “scherzendo” and designated “C4” in the sketch. The rhythmic contour of the beginning of idea XVII is also found on the same sketch page (p.21, l.5), as well as the rhythmic incipits of what becomes figure XIX and the sixteenth pickup of takeover idea XIII. (Page 21 is transcribed later, below, in conjunction with the discussion of m.79ff.)
Example 7.21: Transcription of Berg 13/ii, page 31, sketch for m.52ff

Notes:

1. idea XVI (m.52)
2. development of II
3. attempt at XVII
4. idea 'D' XIII (too soon)
5. delta-2 imitation[!]; again to XIII
The sketches on pages 31 and 33 are transcribed in Examples 7.21 and 7.22. The sketch on page 31, Example 7.21 (see previous page), takes over the idea first intimated on p.21. Sketched measure numbers '45-48' correspond to score mm.52-55. The reader will note that the rhythmic figure in m.‘45’ on sketchbook page 31 features the punchy rising chromatic gesture at the end of idea XVI (m.52). The rhythmic contours of the motive-II-based horn warbles and idea XVII then ensue. Sketched measure numbers ‘49’ and ‘50’ have been crossed out and replaced by ‘55’ and ‘56’ (‘50’ is overwritten with ‘56’). The later measure numbers as sketched at the bottom of page 31, mm.’55-60’ posit takeover idea XIII (score m.73f) and also clearly suggest, in rhythmic contour, the return—in imitation—of delta-2. In the score, the delta-2 idea does not appear in imitation until after the Höhepunkt (m.126); the idea does, however, serve as the tail of the 'Wozzeck-quotation passage' (mm.82-83), which will be discussed below.

Sketched measures ‘49–50’ reappear on sketchbook page 33 (see transcription on next page, Example 7.22). Their contents, however, match measures ‘46–47’ on page 31. It therefore seems likely that Berg first envisioned a more squarely sequential statement of the warbling horns idea: sketched mm. ‘46–49’ (p.31) answered by ‘49–51’ (p.33). The two passages were to be connected by upward-rising idea IX-1 (see p.31, end of m.‘48’). (IX-1 becomes the Nebenstimme in the score, mm.52–53.) Once Berg decided that the entry of takeover motive XIII as sketched on p.31 (m.‘49’) was premature; he tried out a different continuation on p.33 (m.‘51’). Specifically, the sketch suggests the repeated use of cadential idea XI. The ballooned insertion of m.‘52’ at the top of the page also suggests the rhythmic contour of cadential idea XI, as well as the contour of idea V (bracketed and marked ‘A’, above the staff.). Both of these ideas are subtley subsumed into the score: idea XI is transformed into smoother-contoured violin Nebenstimme of mm.54–55;
Example 7.22: Transcription of Berg 13/ii, page 33, another sketch for m.52ff

Notes:  
1. anticipates idea XXII (m.78)  
2. ballooned insert; V up top  
3. right measure of systems scribbled over  
4. XIII "unisono" (m.71)
idea V—specifically, its characteristic representation of SC 5–37 [03458] as linked [014]s—becomes part of the pitch content of the Hauptstimme itself (at mm.53–54, as was shown above). The lower portion of sketchbook page 33 is rather more confused; however, the indication “unisono” below the rhythm of takeover idea XIII anticipates its bold unison assertion in horns and timpani in m.71 and its ‘tutti’ summation in mm.76–77 of the score. (The chords on the top of sketchbook p.33 are a tentative effort at idea XXII, m.78ff; that passage is discussed below).

Finally, the sketches for this subsection found on pages 26 and 44 concern interjection idea XVIII. Page 26 will be recalled from our discussion of formal sketches (see Example 7.13(b) and 7.14(b), pp.418, 420, and 422, above). Page 44 is transcribed in Example 7.23 (see next page). The first measure on the page (annotated as m.’56’) features the tremolo rhythm of the horn warble (like score m.54), followed by the outline of the Nebenstimme rhythm (cf. viola and cello) from the end of score m.55. The second sketched measure unmistakably provides the rhythmic contour of interjection idea XVIII. Berg has bracketed the final snap, and shows how linkage technique connects it to the incipit of idea XIX (sketch line 4, score m.57). The sketch goes on to imply the contours of the interlocking fragments of II found in the upper strings in m.58 of the score, and the repetition of XVIII in m.59. The bottom system of the sketch disintegrates: it does not clearly express the ‘tutti’ chords of m.60–61, nor the imitative action of XIX. The next sketchbook page, page 45, does little to clarify the immediate continuation found in the score, but it does, as we shall see shortly, include the rhythmic contour for the principal theme of the next subsection, the ‘grazioso’.
Example 7.23: Transcription of Berg 13/ii, page 44, sketch for mm.55–59

Notes:

1. interjection idea XVIII
2. motivic link to XIX
3. scribbled out
4. XIX rhythmic continuity and subdivision
Middle Section cont’d, *grazioso*, mm.62–66

The principal idea of this elegant subsection is the *grazioso* theme shown in Example 7.24:

Example 7.24: *grazioso* theme, mm.62–66

The tune begins with a tightknit presentation function, the basic idea (oboe and celesta) answered by its repetition (clarinet and harp) in exact inversion. Expressed as a pc string: <56 8507 32 B1B9> is answered by <87 5816 AB 2024>. The dyads sum to index number 1, and are thus related by (canonical transformation) T₁₁. More concretely, the two statements hold the border pitches of their 013 incipits, F₄ and Ab₄, registrally invariant; and the registral extrema of the two statements yield the same pcs: apex F₅ and nadir G#₃. Various segmentations of the pc content of the basic idea are feasible. (The repetition, as an exact inversion, will of course produce the same SCs.)

Following the 013 incipit, one might segment the subsequent overlapping pentachords: <85073> 5–27 [01358] and <32B19> 5–9 [01246]. The accents caused by the registral leaps to F₅ and D₅ also suggest recognition of
tetrachords <5073> 4-22 [0247] and <2B19> 4-11 [0135]. The continuation of the theme (m.64-65) operates sequentially, <1 6A2 7> (SC 5-22 [01478]) followed by <5 7B3 8> (SC 5-26 [02458]); only the first pitch diverges from strict sequence, the last four pitches in both cases instance SC 4-19 [0148] (<6A27> and <8B38>). The two concluding segments (m.65-66)—in which continuation function becomes (=>) cadential—feature descending chromatic trichords and pentachords in the contour of an upward leap and a cascade; as pc segments they are: <765 941B8> and <210 693A7>. Their concluding pentachords represent SCs 5-27 [01358] (cf. b.i.) and 5-16 [01347], respectively.

Vertical considerations. There is relatively little correspondence between horizontal and vertical set-class contents in this subsection. Despite the relative squareness of the tune, points of vertical articulation that are metrically emphasized tend to be scumbled by the afterbeat activities of one or more voices. Nonetheless, a most interesting confluence of harmonic and melodic action occurs in the approach to the cadence point at m.66, beat 2, where five parts converge on G (pc7). Expressed as pc strings (only the top line is shown in Ex.7.24), their alignment (at m.66) looks like this:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>pc string</th>
<th>role</th>
<th>set-class</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>693A 7</td>
<td>top line</td>
<td>SC 5-16 [01347]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3A50 7</td>
<td>inner</td>
<td>progresses by ic5 downward to pc7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0456 7</td>
<td>parts</td>
<td>progresses by ic1 upward to pc7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9AB0 7</td>
<td></td>
<td>progresses by ic1 up, then ic5 down</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>218 7</td>
<td>bass line</td>
<td>SC 4-9 [0167]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The passage invokes vestiges of tonal goal direction in a striking manner; specifically, the bass motion from pc2 to pc7 suggests dominant-tonic progression, and the upper voices (particularly the top voice) could easily be incorporated into an extended dominant sonority; e.g., D F# A/Ab C E/Eb, with Bb as quasi 'thirteenth'. The vertical sonority at the beginning of this cadential motion recollects the 'dominant minor ninth' as SC 5-31 [01369].
and the penultimate moment before pc7 effects wholetone tetrachord 4–21 [0246] as <8060A>, a typical 'tritone substitution'—where the 'lowered second degree', [neapolitan] Ab, replaces 'dominant' D.

Accompanying ideas. Horns 2–4 fill in the middle register below the tune with the fragmented incipit of rhythmic motive III in trichords (mostly 026s and 037s). This accompaniment figure is linked forward from the final two chords of the cadence of XIX (m.62, beats 1 to 2); in its continuation through mm.64–65 the trichords interact loosely with the tune (e.g., m.64, beat 3 trichords <351 to 7A6> support the continuation <16A2 7>). The bass voice function is incorporated into an elegant cello 'obbligato' based on the first six notes of theme VIII. Expressed as a pc string, the b.i. of the figure reads: <04 4 439 A>, followed by its (T-11) inverse-related <B7 7 782 1>. (Both b.i.'s effect SC 5–19 [01367], a sonority also briefly featured vertically at the beginning of this theme, m.62, b.3 as <08B6 5> and <0 691 7>.) The idea continues with triplet fragments of chained 016s (with one 014): <39 892 43A 980 A94 218>. (See also the discussion of the similar counterpoint for horn in the next section, m.66ff; the two 'obligati' are compared in Ex.7.28.)

Sketches for the grazioso theme are found on page 45 of sketchbook 13/ii, transcribed in Example 7.25 (see next page). The top of the page is extremely faint, its contents unclear; the bottom of the page, also rather obscure, seems to continue the ideas found on the bottom system of the preceding page which together suggest some kind of rhythmic acceleration (perhaps akin to that found in the ancillary parts of mm.69–71). The rhythmic contour of the grazioso theme itself emerges from sketch lines 4 and 6: while the repetition of the basic idea is present, its inversional derivation is not apparent from the contour as sketched. The rhythms of the continuation and cadential functions are also evident in the sketch, though its end again disintegrates.
Example 7.25: Transcription of Berg 13/ii, page 45, sketch for grazioso, m.62ff

Notes:
1. beginning scribbled out
2. rest of line very faint
3. scribbled out
4. blotch and scribble
5. calculations [?]
6. overwritten: numbers suggest rhythmic subdivisions, 3, 6, 8
Middle Section cont’d, ‘big tune’, mm.66–71

The principal idea of this section is the ‘big tune’ itself (DeVoto’s XXI), a swaggering march theme that Douglas Jarman has shown to be a (somewhat loose) ‘serial derivation’ from the pitch string buried in the opening texture as the continuation of rhythmic motive III (Jarman 1979: 43, Ex.44; see also DeVoto 1984: 426–430, Exx.18–19 for a comparison of the two passages). The tune itself is shown in Example 7.26:

Example 7.26: ‘big tune’, theme XXI, mm.66–71

It consists of a basic idea (violin, m.66–68)—perhaps better understood as a compound basic idea (c.b.i.) subdivided into a basic idea (the first five notes, <21459> SC 5–17 [01348]) and a contrasting or complementary idea (the next five, <9884A> SC 4–5 [0126])—which, without presentational repetition, is immediately developed. The continuation of the tune (trumpet, mm.68–70), <4AB 2657 733>, features 016 <4AB> and 014 <265> trichords (also tetrachord <2657>, 4–4 [0125]), and a prominent rising ‘minor sixth’ (ip8, <733>). The final interval is transposed (T1) to form a link into the remainder of the continuation-cadential idea: <845 35 25A6 0>. That segment
shows an initial 014 trichord, then an oscillating motion between pc5 and chromatic descent <4 3 2> (<453525>); the final tetrachordal tag <25A6> forms the familiar SC 4–19 [0148], or, with the 'goal tone' C6 (pc0) included, <25A60>, SC 5–30 [01468]. This tag is thrice repeated in mm.70–71, as motion to the goal becomes persistent. The trichords shown at the top of the tune have their own voice-leading logic as the lower parts creep upward, chromatically and frenetically, until the final 026 shifts T1 in its entirety: <370 480 590 6A0> and, finally, <7B1>.

Evidence for this derivation of theme XXI from theme III is found on page 46 of sketchbook 13/ii, transcribed in Example 7.27 (see next page). Note that theme XXI as sketched begins from G3; i.e., a twelfth lower than in the score, but at the same pitch level as its parent theme III. In Berg's sketch, this derivative process breaks down soon after the beginning of the continuation. In fact, two rhythmic contours for two continuations are shown: the first (on sketch line 5) suggests an exact repetition of the preceding motive; the second (on line 7) shows the more aggressively developmental rhythm found in the continuation-cadential idea of the score. The last portion of the sketch points the way to takeover rhythm XIII (m.71ff).

Concerning the so-called 'serial derivation' of theme XXI from theme III, it is important to acknowledge that the pc string of theme XXI (suitably transposed at T-7) more closely reflects the form of III found in the score (trombone 2, m.6ff; cf. Ex.7.2, pp.378–379, above), not III in the rather less articulate version found in earlier in this sketchbook (namely, pp.14–15; see Exs.7.7 and 7.8; pp.393–396, above). The discrepancy raises several questions about compositional process: (1) does the evidence of the page 46 sketch suggest that Berg consciously derived XXI from III?; or, (2) does it suggest the process was more intuitive?; indeed, did the page 46 sketch perhaps help, retroactively, to determine the final form of the elaboration of III?
Example 7.27: Transcription of 13/ii, page 46, sketch for 'big tune', m.66ff

Notes: ① bass clef at left ② entries faint ③ page twice stroked out
④ entry scribbled over ⑤ incipit of idea XIII (m.71ff), and on line 10
The sketch of XXI on page 46 matches the sketch of III on page 14 for only the first four pcs: <7 6 9 A>; pc2 (D4) and the remainder of the pc segment is not found in the earlier sketch for III. On the other hand, the string of pcs found on page 46 matches quite precisely those of the elaboration of III found in Berg’s Particell (mm.6–10, Berg 12, folios 18 and 18v). (Aside from the slight confusion that arises from the overwritings in sketch line 2, there is but a single adjustment: G3 is placed between E3 and B3 to form an arpeggiation; in the earlier passage the G follows the B.) One notices, in particular, the shift from C-sharp to C-natural between the seventh and eighth notes of the sketch. This matches precisely the pcs of III as they occur in Particell and score; theme XXI as it occurs in the score, however, (again suitably transposed up a twelfth) omits this chromatic shift (resulting in the repetition of G#5).

Overall, the evidence suggests that Berg began the page 46 sketch perhaps only intuitively aware of its resemblance to the incipit of III; that, subsequently, the shape of XXI as sketched influenced the revision of III, so that when the detailed sketch of the opening texture was transferred to Particell the elaboration of III was adjusted to match the pc string of the page 46 sketch. The ‘big tune’ does not, however, occur at the sketched pitch, but up a twelfth; or—as Berg would no doubt have construed it—the theme occurs in ‘G minor’ in the sketch, but is moved to ‘D minor’ in the score. The probable cause for this shift (which is maintained for the recapitulation of theme XXI in m.144ff, English horn) lies in the strong cadence to G which concludes the grazioso section (as discussed above) and which happens immediately before the tune enters: after such a strong move to G, the ‘big tune’ (even with its obfuscating accompaniment texture) would seem utterly grounded were it to begin on G. The shift up a fifth (twelfth) allows the next strain to open up once more and the ‘big tune’ to push on to a greater climax.
Accompanying ideas. Remarkably, this 'big tune' subsection has no designated Nebenstimmen. Yet there are four distinct accompanying strata.

(1) The bass begins with a variant of XVIII, <B 390 34> (SC 4–12 [0236], overall 5–18 [01457]). Its final semitonal snap is then repeated in downward-arpeggiating fragmentation, <34 9A 56 23>. The last dyad is further compressed: the snaps become grace notes. The main notes of the snaps, <4A63>, produce SC 4–29 [0137]; the main notes of the continuation in grace notes, <0764> (double bass), also instance 4–29. Another variant of XVIII (acting like its looseknit presentational repetition) arises from the bottom note, E2: <4 B61 56> (SC 4–23 [0257] initially as stacked fifths; overall 5–14 [01257]). Once again, the figure continues in fragmented snaps, <56 B0 67 34>, the main notes <6074> producing 4–29; however, the main notes of the subsequent switch to grace notes, <4195>, result in SC 4–19 [0148], and it is this sonority that dominates the remainder of the figure. (See, in particular, trombones 2 and 3, mm.70–71: four repetitions of descending arpeggations of 4–19 are subtended from an upward-arpeggiating 'diminished seventh', <47A1> 4–28 [0369].)

(2) The first horn reworks the cello obbligato from the previous section. The thematic resemblance between these two accompanying ideas contributes greatly to the feeling of formal balance and complementarity between the two subsections—the grazioso and the 'big tune'. A comparison is assisted by Example 7.28 (see next page), where these 'obbligato counterpoints' are juxtaposed. The former passage uses the first six notes of theme VIII, the latter the first six notes of closely-related theme XIII. Recall that the distinguishing moment between these themes comes after the initial third in the rhythm of motive I: in VIII, the next pitch is down a semitone [014]; in XIII, the next pitch steps outside the third, up a semitone [015]. Ex.7.28 shows how these differences in detail play out. In the present subsection, the horn
begins with idea XIII <37 821> 5–7 [01267] and continues with II <0B7–6>; the rising seventh (and underlying 016s) serve to link the two ideas. In m.68, the whole chunk is sequentially repeated (at T2) and fragmentary tags of II’s trill (T–1: <8–7>, <6–5>) set up the texture takeover by XIII that begins from pc5 in m.71 (pickup to last beat).

Example 7.28: Comparison of the ‘obbligato counterpoints’, m.62 and m.66

Pianissimo strata (3), bass clarinet and bassoons, and (4), E-flat clarinet, operate on fragments of the sixteenth note patterns associated with XIX and XX from the preceding subsections. In textural terms, the purpose of these strata is undoubtedly to continue the sixteenth-note saturation of the preceding grazioso subsection, and to increase that saturation to triplet-sixteenth and thirty-second-note levels in the lead-up to the takeover by XIII in m.71ff. Stratum (3) develops into the cello and bassoon counterpoint in m.69ff (<63918> etc.; enhanced in m.70–71 by a split-off in double bass and contrabassoon). Attempting to develop a coherent and co-ordinated account of all pitch details in this stratum—beyond recognition of the general prevalence of linked 014 and 015 trichords—seems an exercise in futility.
Similarly, the rationale for pitch and set-class choices at the beginning of stratum (4), E-flat clarinet, is largely obscure: <95B6> (SC 4–15 [0146]: matches the upper voice of XVIII at m.56 with tritone <5B> in common, but not the variant c: XVIII as it occurs right here in m.66); <4708> (4–19 [0148]: embedded in the sequential continuations of XIX in m.64–65 and later important to the grace-note arpeggiation of stratum (1), discussed above; though unexpected here); and <1B 49 62 9> (4–22 [0247], and overall, diatonic hexachordal SC 6–32 [024579], cf. idea XVII, m.54 [?]: shares pc content with other strata here, but not in a consistent manner). Stratum (4), with added clarinet and oboe, eventually joins the trumpet Hauptstimme on the last beat of m.69 for the move to goal tone C6; this gives rise to a new figure in complementary rhythm (piccolo and glockenspiel) which plays on pitches extracted from the upper-register chords subtended from the high C.

Vertical considerations. Despite the contrapuntal thickness of this subsection, there are several moments of vertical clarity. A wt1 tetrachordal subset, <B 93 1> 4–21 [0246], that marks the beginning of the 'big tune' (m.66, b.3) is also found at the end of the subsection in the shift from high C to C-sharp, <37B1> 4–24 [0248] (m.71, b.3; as the top of SC 6–21 [023468] <B125 37B1>; incidentally, the lower tetrachord in m.71 represents SC 4–12 [0236] which, as <B390>, occurs as idea XVIII at the beginning of the subsection). SC 4–9 [0167] as <4A5B> is also quite audible as the vertical sonority at the beginning of the restatement of XVIII at m.68, b.3. The strongest impression of organized vertical succession is experienced in the repeated moves to C6. The voice-leading of the upper components of this succession has been noted above in our discussion of the Hauptstimme; the full texture yields the following sonorities: m.70, b.1, <B49 370> 6–31 [014579]; m.70, b.3, <7 480> 4–19 [0148]; m.71, b.1, <A 37 590>, 6–33 [023579]; m.71, b.2 <303 6A0> 4–27 [0258], and, finally, m.71, b.3, SC 6–21, as described earlier in this paragraph.
Middle Section concluded, texture takeover (‘D’ [XIII]), m.71ff

The entry of horns and timpani with a variant of XIII marks the beginning of that idea’s texture takeover. Idea XIII is stripped of its initial downbeat, and, hence, of its pedigree to the original XIII, VIII, and I. The new version of XIII becomes obsessed with the 026 trichord. This trichord was contained in the original XIII at mm.31–32, but only at the beginning of its second measure: <04 45BA 460A 4>. Locally, the 026 trichord of XIII is derived from the top of XXI: trumpets, m.71, b.3, <7B1> is transposed T6 in horns and timpani, <55 7175 7175>, tritone <71> preserved in the transformation.

At the point of overlap between subsections (m.71–72), a number of leftovers continue from the previous passage. The designated Nebenstimme in trumpets and clarinets, m.71–72, assists in closing down the preceding section: the figure falls in a manner reminiscent of cadential idea XI. The idea begins from vertical tetrachord <B127> 4–29 [0137]; it is linked directly to the preceding tetrachord, 4–24 [0248] <37B1>, at the top of XXI, and preserves three common pcs {17B}; namely, the same 026 trichord that generates takeover idea XIII. The top voice of the Nebenstimme yields the pc string <746A>, which, in closing the subsection, instances SC 4–12 [0236], and perhaps recalls the SC that helped to begin the subsection as the variant form of interjection XVIII (m.66, bass, <B309>). (Such a relation is admittedly obscure, since apart from their opening and closing formal positions, and the recognition of their generally opposite contours—XVIII is all up, XI all down—there appears to be little reason for us to associate the two passages; nonetheless, their pitch contents are, in abstract terms, T7 related: {9B03} and {467A}.)

Another subsection-overlapping idea is the sixteenth-note flurries in the extreme registers. The lower line (cello and double bass, bassoon and
contrabassoon) joins together two instances of SC 4–12 [0236] as <125B> and <79A1> followed by 4–18 [0147] as <B256>. (Note that, though this analytical segmentation proves useful, it is not reinforced by Berg's articulations and orchestrational doublings). The upper line (piccolo, glockenspiel, and violin) begins with SC 4–14 [0237] as <21B6> and breaks into a flutter of sextuplet sixteenths <6975432>, then closes with SC 5–18 [01457] as <27A19>, its tetrachord subsegments representing SCs 4–18 [0147] and 4–12 [0236]. The loosely mirrored relation between these registral extrema is thus supported by certain set-class correspondences: 4–12 and 4–18.

Comparison of the final metrically-emphasized segments (m.72, b.1–2) in both parts shows the subtlety of the mirroring arrangement: bottom <1(B)256> and top <2(7)1A9>. Omission of the cast-off pcs on the second sixteenth (shown here in parentheses) results in two instances of symmetrical SC 4–7 [0145]. The mirroring is rendered explicit by the repetition of the leftover 014 tags <1A9> over <256> in violin and viola (m.72, b.3–4); the vertically paired dyads, <21> <5A> and <69>, sum to 3 (modulo 12).

The complete list of 'sum-3 dyads' (or dyads with 'index number' of 3) can be read from an alignment of ascending and descending chromatic segments beginning from pcs 0 and 3:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This inversional abstraction (with axes at pc pairs <12> and <78>) assists in determining the rationale behind the choice of pcs for the entries of XIII as it continues to take over the texture in mm.73–75. Those entries are summarized in chart form in Figure 7.7 (see next page).
The first entry of revised XIII (horns and timpani, m.71) begins on pc5, with 026 trichord <571>. The violas enter in m.73 in two voices; they begin with a pairing of pcs <5 and A> but immediately snap to <9 and 6>. (The motive is an instance of linkage; it recalls explicitly the last notes of the mirror-related violin and viola fragments in m.72.) The intial snaps, <A to 9> over <5 to 6>, may be read off the sum-3 table. (Note, however, that because the voice-leading of the subsequent 026s, <9B5 over 682>, is parallel [rather than contrary], their remaining vertically aligned dyads—<B over 8> and <5 over 2>—have a difference [rather than a sum] of 3.) The next entry (clarinets and bassoons, m.74) begins on pcA: it relates to the preceding pair as the first entry relates to that pair; namely, first entry <5> is linked to the <5 and A> pair which is linked to <A>. Stretto entries quickly follow on pc3 (trumpet, m.74) and pc0 (tuba and cello, m.75). Thus, all entries to this point may be understood to operate with sum-3 dyads.

The final entries (m.75) are subject to diminution as the texture saturates and the surface rhythmic activity accelerates. The entries, pcs <4> (trombone) and <7> (oboe and English horn), seem to break the pattern, since their expected sum-3 dyadic partners, respectively <B> and <8>, do not establish points of entry. Although it is true that those partner pcs can be
found at the end of the immediately preceding 026s, <35B> and <028>, the break from pattern after the entry on pc <0> remains aurally evident. In addition, pcs <0>, <4> and <7> introduce diminuted entries of their attached 026s (in sixteenth, triplet sixteenth, and thirty-second notes, respectively); and the final two pcs, <6> (double bass) and <1> (violin pizz.), manage only the incipit pickup of the idea (again in triplet sixteenth, and thirty-second note forms).

Another analytic view of the passage further assists our understanding of its organizational principles. As already noted, the variant of idea XIII used in this subsection effects a succession of 026 trichords. The presence of the tritone in such trichords means that tritone transposition (T₆) of any representative set of the set-class results in another set that preserves the same tritone. [The tritone would be similarly preserved under inversion (T₀I) or inversion followed by tritone transposition (T₆I); Berg, however, uses only transpositions of his initial <571> in the passage; of course <571> itself happens to be an inversional form of 026, T₇I of the representative prime form.] As there are only six possible unordered pairs of tritones (0/6, 1/7, 2/8, 3/9, 4/A, and 5/B), the T₆-related representatives of SC [026] can be grouped into six pairs according to the tritone that characterizes each pair.

Using Berg's initial <571> as the T₀ model, these six T₆-related pairs would be: T₀/6 <571> and B17>, T₁/7 <682 and 028>, T₂/8 <793 and 139>, T₃/9 <8A4 and 24A>, T₄/A <9B5 and 35B>, and T₅/B <A06 and 460>. The actual succession of 026s in the passage can now be shown, their characteristic tritones underlined: <571>, <A>to<9B5> over <5>to<682>, <A06>, <35B>, <028>, <460>, <793>, with <6[82]> and <1[39]> perhaps implied in the final incomplete entries. The succession of characteristic tritones in these 026s (expressed in simplest form as unordered pairs with lowest pc integer first) is thus: {17, 5B and 28, 06; 5B and 28, 06; 93, (82), and (39)}. Note that following
the initial \(17\) of \(<571\>, the characteristic tritones repeat: pairs \(\{5, 28, 06\}\) happen twice in succession. The *divisi* violas (m.73, joined by *divisi* violins 2 in m.74) effect a pair of tritone pairs, \(<5B>\) and \(<28>\), which together form a complete ‘diminished seventh’, SC 4–28 [0369]. The referential vertical pc pair of the violas entry is \(<69>\): with the subsequent entries (i.e., after the entry \(<A06>\) in m.74) on pcs \(<3>\) (Eb7, trumpet, m.74, \(<35B>\)) and \(<0>\) (C3, tuba and cello, m.75, \(<028>\) an alternative \([0369]\) is suggested; moreover, the characteristic tritones of the entries on \(<3>\) and \(<0>\) once again produce the \{258B\} representative of 4–28. (The third possible 4–28 \{147A\} is not directly expressed: at least partial entries occur on each of these pcs, but there seems no reason to group them into this set-class; tritone \(17\) is of course present in the opening \(<571\), but the \{4A\} pair is altogether absent.)

Note that all transpositions of the initial \(<571>\) occur except \(T_6\) (which would return the same tritone), \(T_{3/9}\) (which would produce the tritone pair \(4/A\) \[E/Bb\]—structurally very important in the piece but avoided in this subsection), and \(T_8\) (though it is perhaps implied in the final incomplete entry on pc1 [Db], and its characteristic tritone was in the preceding \(T_2\)). The succession of transpositions relative to the initial \(pc<5>\) of \(<571>\) as \(T_0\) is: \(T_0<5>, T_4<9>\) and \(T_1<6>, T_5<A>, T_A<3>, T_7<0>, T_B<4>, T_2<7>, (T_1<6>), and (T_8<1>\). This suggests an organized chain of transpositions, or a transformational network, as outlined in *Figure 7.8*:

*Figure 7.8: Possible transformational network behind mm.71–75*

\[
\begin{align*}
<5> & \quad T_5 & \quad <A>T_5<3> \\
014 & 014 & T_5 & 014 & 014 & 016
\end{align*}
\]

initial pcs for 026s: \(<5>\) \(\{<9\text{ and }6>\}\) \(<A>, <3> <0> <4> <7> <(6)> <(1)>

\[
\begin{align*}
T-5 & \quad T-5(?)
\end{align*}
\]
Figure 7.8 shows that the chain of transformations effects 014s between
the initial tones of the 026 statements, as <5 to 9 and 6> and <9 and 6 to A>,
and, later, as <3 to 0 to 4> and perhaps also as <3 ... to 4 to 7>. The connection
between the initial <5> and the next single-voiced statement from <A> is T5,
as is the move from there to the 026 beginning on <3>. The lower register
entry on pc <0> might be understood as T-5 from the opening, the statement
from <7> a further T-5, though expressed in the upper register. The final
compressed or incomplete statements from pcs <7>, <6>, and <1> produce 016
as a kind of terminating succession. These final entries also help set up the
beginning of the next subsection (Etwas breiter, m.76ff): the characteristic
tritone in the highest voice of m.75, from pc <7> (as G5, <793>, oboe and
English horn) is cast into the lowest voice of the septachord in m.76, where it
is incorporated into an inversionally-derived 026 (from F2, cello 2, <539>); the
incomplete statement from F#2 (pc <6>) in m.75 shifts down a semitone to
begin a complete statement from F2 at the bottom of the m.76 chord; and the
fragmentary pc <1> (as violin pizz. Db4) is carried forward into the m.76 chord
(as violin pizz. and oboe Db5).

Overall, three organizational principles, as outlined above, contribute
to the structural ordering of mm.71–75: the pitch and pitch-class relations
described by sum-3 dyads, the characteristic invariant tritones in Tn-related
026 motives, and the transformational network of transpositional operators.
The process begins with the first entry of the variant of XIII, <571>, itself T6-
related to the <7B1> trichord at the top of 'big tune' XXI. Motivic remnants of
the preceding subsection in the extreme registers of the accompanying parts
(mm.72–73) establish pitch-based mirror symmetry; the sum-3 dyads of that
symmetry are partially realized in the rest of the passage as the pitch-class
points of entry for 026 motivic statements. Another important feature of
those 026 statements is the controlled succession of their characteristic
tritones. Finally, consideration of the whole passage as a transformational network shows how the generative 014 trichord in particular continues as a structural force—here invoked as an ordering of transpositional operators (or, expressed more concretely, as an ordering of motive-initiating pcs)—even where its surface presence has been eliminated. The T5 relations shown in the network have a more general and neutralizing role: repeated T5 (or T−5) transposition of 026 guarantees a fresh tritone; one can go up five 'fourths' or down five 'fourths' before the original tritone returns. Or, one can use a combination of 'ups and downs', as Berg does here: up two fourths from <571> for entries <A06> and <35B>, and down two fourths from <571> for entries <028> and <793>; a further move in either direction would have produced <8A4> or <24A>, the characteristic tritone of which, {4A}—though in the large-scale of paramount structural importance—seems assiduously avoided in this subsection.

'Codetta', Etwas breiter, mm.76–79; AND Close and (Re)transition, part 1: 'Wozzeck quotation', mm.79–83

With the broader, quasi-tutti statement of idea XIII as a seven-part verticality in m.76, the texture takeover is complete, and the Middle Section is concluded. In formal terms, the passage can also be understood as a culminating 'codetta' to the first half of the piece. In this respect, the takeover by XIII stands in the formal position that might normally be occupied by the closing thematic idea of a sonata exposition. Measures 76–80 include such standard exposition-ending devices as broadening tempo and motivic redundancy; the falling contour of the string chords and the repetition of "settling tones" by both brass and strings (DeVoto 1984: 399) also contribute to the general feeling of large-scale dénouement. It is a feeling shortlived. Example 7.29 (next two pages) examines mm.76–83.
Example 7.29: *Etwas breiter* and *Wozzeck* quotation passages, mm.76–83
Example 7.29 (cont’d): Wozzeck quotation passage ...

delta-2 tag

Retransition
Comments on Example 7.29. Mm.76–78 have two competing Hauptstimmen: septachordal XIII in strings and upper woodwinds (later string chords XXII), and a variant of IX-2 for brass that streaks through the texture with feral ferocity. The septachords (on lines 1 and 2 of the Example) have certain built-in redundancies. The melodic voices at the registral extremes of the chords produce different, SCs 5–8 [02346] (top) and 5–13 [01248] (bottom), but both are constructed from the motivic trichordal succession [026]+[014]. Vertically (see the vertical lines to the left of the chords), the lower trichord of the septachord is also a [026] (as <5B9>); and the upper tetrachord, as [0148] (4–19 as <4180>), contains [014], though not disposed in a way that would emphasize this fact. The succession of verticals results in the following succession of sepatchords: SCs 7–21; 7–14, 7–19, 7–14; 7–21; 7–37, 7–36, 7–37; and 7–21. Because the redundant SCs always return exactly the same pc-set, there is an impression of ‘nested looping’: 7–21 marks the beginning, middle, and end; 7–14 and 7–37 are the repeated pc-sets in the two internal loops. The vertical lines to the right of the final 7–21 show how its lower trichordal and upper tetrachordal SCs become incorporated into the string octachord that begins the next idea (XXII); in this context, the ‘extra’ note in the string chord is the G5 attached to A5—this A–G dyad becomes a central element in the rest of the passage.

The IX-2 variant in tuba (line 3 of the Example)—abetted by contrabassoon and double bass—begins with 014 and overlapping 016 trichords. The trombones continue with 016 and chromatic 012. The horns then extract a [0148] from the final 7–21 chord before pressing two 012s from their extreme upper register. The subsequent descent produces “settling tones” <Bb–A–G>. The strings chords (idea XII) have an overall descending contour into their settling tones, <F–Eb–Db>. The voice-leading of the inner string parts, as shown by the connecting lines on the Example, is a rather
elaborate amalgam of creeping, wedging, and registral transfer. The outer voices, however, progress with direct downward contour: the upper voice instances SC 4–5 [0126], 6–22 [012468] overall, as <8379531>, its final segment establishing wt1 subcollections; the lower voice yields SC 4–26 [0358], 6–32 [024579] overall as <0952A79> if the lower-voice (brass) settling tones are included.

In mm.79–80, both ‘settling motions’ are pruned into a pair of dyads: <Eb–Db> over <A–G>. The dyads <Eb–Db> and <A–G> become obsessive in their reiterations; the register expands upward, and the tempo accelerates: the passage begins to take on the formal character of transition. The upper part effects a rising and intervallically-expanding series of dyads: <31(ic2), 42(ic2), 08(ic4), 71(ic6)>, producing SC 7–38 [0124578]. This is the so-called ‘Wozzeck quotation’: the Marsch passage from m.79–83 largely shows the same musical contents as Act I, scene 2, mm.274–278. In Chapter 2 (pp.65–67 and 73–74) I discussed many of the chronological and documentary issues associated with these passages—the relevant Marsch sketches will be illustrated shortly—and I also traced their pedigree back to the Symphonie-Fragment. We are now in a position to examine the musical details. Example 7.30 shows the opera excerpt; Example 7.31 shows the beginning of the Symphonie-Fragment. Both (see next two pages) should be compared with Example 7.29, m.79ff.

In the opera excerpt, the 7–38 melodic statement ends with pc7(G4), rather than returning to pc1(C#4). We then find a 036 trichord (as <390>) and an [0147] tetrachord (SC 4–18 as <6B25>); in the Marsch the two sets are overlapped: 036 as snappish <906> links to <6B25> (which embeds another 036 as <B25>). Janet Schmalfeldt (1983: 150–155 and 262n6) has pointed out that the rising parallel chords inside the texture in mm.277–278 (Ex.7.30, compare Ex.7.29, Marsch mm.82–83) instance the abstract complement of the 7–38 melody: SC 5–38 [01258].
Example 7.30: *Wozzeck*, I/2, mm.273–279; compare Ex.7.29 *Marsch*, mm.79–84

a tempo (schwer und wuchtig) e. 40–44
(tempo)

---

poco a poco accel.

---

molto rit.

a tempo

---
Example 7.31: *Symphonie-Fragment*, opening; compare Ex.7.30 (and Ex.7.29)

Ziemlich langsamer \( \frac{4}{4} \)  poco accel.

---

Copyright 1984 by Universal Edition A.G., Wien
Segmentation of the upper line (viola) in mm.82–83 of the *Marsch* also suggests recognition of a melodic instance of 5–38, as <6 B25 7> (its border pcs, <6 and 7>, are also contained in the preceding 7–38); in the opera, the surface articulation works contrary to such a segmentation. As can be heard (and seen in Ex.7.29), idea delta-2 sneaks into the texture of the *Marsch* at this point (m.82, beginning from B4); although we do not really notice it has entered until the ‘tag’, in parallel sevenths, in m.83. Expressed in pc integers, the delta-2 segment reads: <B25 785 + 32 15>. (Note that a pitch-proper rendering of delta-2 requires that we move from the lower voice of the melody on the first beat of m.83 <785> to the upper line on the second and third beats <32 15>). Though the notes of the first part of this figure can also be located in the opera excerpt (m.278), the characteristic profile of delta-2—in particular, its definitive concluding upward flip of a third—is not present there.

The lower part in both *Marsch* and opera passages continues to return to, and to reiterate, the A–G dyad; the alternative dyads are enclitic to the notes of the melodic line. Both passages end when the parallel 5–38 chords are altered to produce a shift from wt0 to wt1 subcollections; the oscillating A–G dyad is maintained across the divide (mm.83–84; opera, mm.278–279). The design of the bass line of both passages displays similarities to that of the *Symphonie-Fragment*. This relationship is illustrated in the annotations to Example 7.30 and 7.31. (It was also briefly described in Chapter 2.) The extended stems drawn onto the oscillating, rising bass line of the *Wozzeck* passage (Ex.7.30) should be compared with those drawn onto the bass line of the *Symphonie-Fragment* (Ex.7.31). While the correspondence is far from perfect, there are a number of strikingly similar features; notably, the initial [G–A] lower dyad, the [Eb–Db] upper dyad (contained in the opening cluster of Ex.7.31), and the oscillating expansion of the bass lines from [G–A] upwards to F# and Ab.
Several prominent trichordal and tetrachordal components are common to all three excerpts. Note, for example, the 4–18s in the opening two measures of the Fragment and (after the 7–38 melody) in m.277 of Wozzeck (=m.82 of the Marsch). The 4–18s in the Fragment are built from overlapping 014 and 016 trichords; they become the generative trichords of its subsequent main theme (m.5)—a role they also play for much of Opus 6. The 4–19s which follow in mm.3 and 4 of the Fragment are built from overlapping 014s. SC 4–19 is also a prominent feature of the upper voice in the opera excerpt at m.276. Though the same 4–19 could be extracted from the identical point in the Marsch (m.81), the predominantly dyadic segmentation found there works at cross purposes (see the slurs in Ex.7.29). It will be recalled, however, that SC 4–19 functioned as a key subset in the big verticals of Marsch mm.76–77, which was then extracted by the horns as part of the development of idea IX-2 (m.77). Overall, it is important to emphasize that, while the Marsch passage and the Wozzeck excerpt clearly share the same fundamental musical contents, the Symphonie-Fragment shows only general similarities of gesture and sonority: nonetheless, it is tempting to see the roots of both later passages in the Fragment.

The main sketch evidence for the preceding Marsch passages begins on page 20 of sketchbook 13/ii, which is transcribed in Example 7.32 (see next page). Berg heads the page with a roman numeral ‘III’. The ‘III’ may refer to this material as the third large chunk of the work; i.e., it follows exposition and middle section materials. The sketch—for takeover idea XIII in the version familiar from m.76ff—is given the thematic and sectional designation ‘D’; i.e., it follows the sketches for ‘A’ (Exposition), on pp.13–15; ‘B’ (Counter-Exposition and some of Transition), on pp.16–18; and ‘C’ (beginning of Middle Section proper), on p.19.
Example 7.32: Transcription of Berg 13/ii, page 20, sketch for ‘D’, idea XIII

Notes:  
1. “III.” and “D” formal designations; top system boxed off  
2. lowest note probably F (overwrites staff line 2)  
3. Eb continues?  
4. beginning of idea XIII faint  
5. # sign crossed out; (chordal idea XXII?)  
6. motivic bracket with arrow connects to motive II on page 21
(Comments on Ex.7.32, continued.) The sketch labelled ‘D’ on page 20 shows the rhythmic form and general contour—though not the specific pitch contents—of idea XIII as found at m.71 and m.76. The 026 upper-voice melodic trichord is discernible (though as <793> rather than <026> as in the score). The layout suggests that Berg contemplated following XIII with a return of the chordal pattern of idea X (see end of first system and beginning of second system of the sketch). (The same thing is suggested in another sketch of idea XIII found on page 29 of 13/ii.) In the score, such a succession occurs only much later in the piece: the three-octave string ‘bariolage’ (DeVoto 1984: 403) on the note D in mm.134–135 is instigated by a statement of XIII <24A> on timpani; a sophisticated recollection of mm.25ff (idea X) then follows in m.136ff (the passage will be discussed later).

The chords labeled ‘a’ and ‘b’ on the bottom system of the Ex.7.32 suggest idea XXII (m.78f). The downward curving line to the right of idea XIII (on line 6) is an arrow connecting XIII to a slightly more thorough development of XXII on the next sketchbook page (p.21, transcribed next, below). Berg isolates a rising seventh motive (see his bracket on line 6) at the end of idea XIII. The upward curving line on the right side of the sketch page is an arrow which connects the bracketed motive to a statement of idea II on sketchbook page 21. It is important to observe that such a motivic seventh is not present in the structurally important version of XIII that Berg here designates ‘D’. The interval can, however, be found in variants of XIII that come earlier in the score: e.g., m.31, where the idea first arises as an alternative to VIII; and m.66, the horn ‘obbligato’ Nebenstimme (Ex.7.28, p.457), where XIII is in fact followed by idea II—as these sketches suggest.

Numerous such essays on XIII’s connectability are found in the sketches (e.g., on pp.29, 31, 33, 34, 36, 41, 46, and 49), but the idea always occurs in its distinctive later rhythmic form (with sixteenth-note pickup).
Example 7.33: Transcription of Berg 13/ii, page 21, 'C4', ideas II & XVII, XXII

Notes:
1. top of system very faint
2. arrow from p.20; motive II
3. '8' for 8va or possibly a treble clef
4. page variously crossed out
5. measure numbers overwritten 53–63
6. chord faint
7. "d ausw +++d": word unclear; "D ausweichend"[?], "auswend[??]"

...
Example 7.33 (see preceding page) transcribes page 21 of the sketchbook. The top line of the sketch bears a hint of delta-1 (not found in this fashion in the score). Line 2 shows the instance of idea II which discussed above; the arrow below the figure is connected to the bracketed seventh at the end of idea XIII on page 20. The rhythm of III (on line 3) and the development of II (at the end lines 1 and 2) make it clear that the indication 'C4' (top) and the description 'scherzendo' (right) refer to the Flottes Marschtempo horn warbles at m.53f.

The sequence of material on sketchbook pages 19–21 therefore suggests that Berg sketched idea 'D' (XIII) on page 20 (for m.76f) before (or at least independently of) the Middle Section continuation here designated 'C4' (i.e., the development of motive II at m.53f). On page 19, he had already sketched idea 'C3', a variant of IX-1 which first occurs at the end of the Counter-Exposition, m.24, and which becomes the main idea for the Middle Section proper, m.46ff. (The p.19 sketch was discussed above in conjunction with the Formal Sketches [p.416ff] and the Middle Section [p.432ff]). Part of the task of Particell and score—intimated by the arrows connecting motives and ideas on sketchbook pages 20–21—becomes the smoother preparation of the texture takeover by idea 'D' (XIII) at mm.71 and 76, through the various motivic developments of the Middle Section. These developments include: the careful establishment of the 'earlier forms' of XIII (in the Transition, part 2, m.31; and in the 'obligato counterpoint' XIII–II at m.66) as an alternative to VIII (in the succession VIII–alpha at mm.29 and 33; and in the 'obligato counterpoint' VIII at m.62); and the motive-II related aspects of the developments of IX-1 and IX-2 (at mm.29 and 47) and of 'II-becomes-XVII' at m.54.

The beginning of the 'II-becomes-XVII' rhythmic pattern is discernible on line 5 of the page 21 sketch. (Other inklings of idea XVII were shown in
the transcriptions of pp.31 [Ex.7.21, p.443] and 33 [Ex.7.22, p.445], above.) Lines 8–10 of the sketch concern idea XXII—the string chords of m.78–80. The indications “rit” and “calando” are appropriate. (This “calando” indication also follows idea XIII at the bottom of sketchbook page 29). The general descending contour and the “settling tones” rhythm are also evident. The pitch content, however, is vague, and far removed from that of the score. The last line of the sketch begins to show the dyadic pattern of the ‘Wozzeck-quotation’ passage.

The next two pages of the sketchbook, pages 22 and 23, are rather too sparse in musical contents to warrant transcription of their complete layouts. However, the pages concern further aspects of the ‘Wozzeck-quotation’ passage and are therefore of considerable documentary value. They are described here.

Page 22 bears the text: "immer mehr Bewegung, schließlich rubato[m] Marsch zu / Paukenwirbel" (i.e., “always more motion, finally rubato march to / timpani roll”). The timpani roll is then shown in musical notation: a sextuplet sixteenth-note figure on the notes Eb and Db (lines 3 and 5 of the sketch). Beneath this, Berg writes: "66 – 70 E / Orgelpunkt [Schlg] Abgang zu II = 75". The measure number references are, understandably, not those of the final score, nor even exactly those of later sketches; ‘E’ is a formal label (recall the formal sketch of page 25, transcribed in Ex.7.14(a), p.419, above). References to an “organ point,” to percussion (“Schlg” = Schlagwerk), and to the “exit to [part] II” all point to the passage from m.84–90 that leads to the second half of the piece. The timpani roll at that point in the score is on the notes A–G rather than the Eb–Db of the sketch. But it is of course precisely the pairing of these dyads (A–G and Eb–Db) that gives rise to the immediately preceding measures, the Wozzeck-quotation passage of mm.80–83.
Page 23 of the sketchbook (line 3) shows only the barest outline of the expanding dyads of that passage: the entry is marked with formal label 'E', begins with the dyad Eb–D (though a Db is perhaps still to be understood from the previous page, to which it is connected by an arrow), and has textual references to rising triadic sonorities in quarter note rhythm: "dazu Ak[kord]" and "aufsteigende Akkord (überm Dreik[an]g in Vierteln)".

Other attempts at the descending chordal progression (idea XXII) that introduces this passage can be found at bottom of page 39 and at the top of page 49 of sketchbook 13/ii. Both entries consist of little more than stick rhythms and rough contours. The upper part of page 39 essays a two-chord progression, and a variant of the idea succession IX–X–XI. The version of X suggests its modification from straight half or quarter notes to dotted quarter, eighth, quarter; a combination with the rhythm of XII is suggested; XI is followed immediately by the trill figure of II—none of these efforts materializes in the score. Moreover, the descending contour of idea XXII (p.39, lines 9–10) is in eighth-note values, rather than the quarter-note values of the score. On the other hand, Berg's sketched measure number annotations ('76' and '79 '80') are surprisingly close to accurate.

Page 49 has altogether greater documentary value. It is transcribed in Example 7.34 (see next page). Recall that page 49 of sketchbook 13/ii is the final page of the first half of the sketchbook, and, therefore, the final page for Opus 6; the remainder of the sketchbook has separately numbered pages and concerns Berg's earliest sketches for Wozzeck.
Example 7.34: Transcription of Berg 13/ii, page 49; final page of 13/ii for Op.6

Notes:

1 leaf 47–48 insert glued to margin side of this page
2 very faint
3 faint entry
4 glue stains and blotches
5 first crossed out, second faint
6 page stroked through
The top of sketchbook page 49 shows—again, in stick rhythm only—the descending contour of idea XXII, with the accurate[!] measure number "78". The first two systems on the page concern the 'Wozzeck-quotation' passage, mm.78–83. Though the entries are extremely faint, the underlying basis of the passage is evident on two counts: first, the rather plodding quarter note rhythm (shown in the sketch at mm.81–82 and perhaps originally related to idea X) becomes the Hauptstimme idea in the score (viola and double bass), where it is counterpointed by the eighth-note (trombone) dyads already prefigured in the earlier sketches (pp.21 and 23, noted above); second, the presence of the delta-2 tag is also—though just barely—perceptible at the end of the second system, with its characteristic concluding upward-third contour and a little crescendo-mark flare. The extreme right-hand side of lines 3 through 5 must be connected with the sketch at the bottom of the page; it concerns the immediately preceding passage, the texture takeover by idea XIII.

It will be recalled from the general description of the documents in Chapter 3 and from the discussion of the "Walzer" sketch in the analysis of Reigen (Chapter 5, page 267, Ex.5.13) that pages 47–48 of sketchbook 13/ii are a glued-in leaf of slightly different paper type, a leaf probably transplanted from the Stadtbibliothek sketchbook gatherings (MH 14.263/c; which, as Chapter 3 posits, might originally have been amalgamated with the Altenberglieder sketchbook, A-Wn F 21 Berg 65). Page 47 contains the Reigen "Walzer" sketch. Page 48 (its verso) also contains ideas that were perhaps originally intended for Opus 6, maybe for the Marsch (one might claim, for instance, that the continuation rhythm of grazioso theme XX is recognizable); but, if this is so, the sketches are of little musical significance.

The documentary matter is raised here once again for two reasons: (1) the insertion of the p.47–48 leaf means that the sketch on page 46—the one
for the 'big tune' (idea XXI), as transcribed in Ex.7.27 (p.454, above)—originally went directly to this sketch on page 49 for takeover idea XIII and closing idea XXII. And (2): the last page for Opus 6 in sketchbook 13/ii contains a sketch for—though not the only sketch for (recall our comments on sketchbook pages 21–23, above)—the 'Wozzeck'-quotation' passage. Yet there is no documentary evidence that the 'hallucination Leitsektion'—as the passage in the opera is sometimes known—was amongst the earliest sketches for the opera. To be sure, some tentative sketches for other elements in Act I/2 are found in the second half of 13/ii. But we are still left wondering what the rationale is for the overlap between the works.

As was intimated in Chapter 2, a clue to the personal significance of the quotation—Berg's reuse of the passage in Wozzeck—ought to be found in the operatic text, Wozzeck's "Es wandert was mit uns da unten! (Something's following us down there below!)". If the musical quotation has any personal significance for Berg, we might speculate that that significance hinges on the overwhelming experience of the creative gestation of the Marsch, an experience which no doubt impressed itself upon the young composer with all the force of the ominous rumblings and hallucinatory imaginings that besiege the character Wozzeck. In any case, the musical overlap and possible psychological border between the two works is reflected in a documentary border: page 49 of sketchbook 13/ii.

Within the Marsch, the formal role of the material of the 'Wozzeck'-quotation' is transformative. The large-scale dénouement predicted by the descending string chords (idea XXII) does not materialize. As the 'settling tones' become obsessive in their reiterations (mm.79–80), the register expands upward (m.80ff), and the tempo accelerates (m.81ff): the passage shifts away from potential closure and adopts the formal character of 'transition'.
(Re)transition, part 2: cresc.-accel. block on idea VI, mm.84–90

Or, possibly, 'retransition'. The passage which comes next, mm.84–90, is another of those clever Bergian 'orchestral blocks'; in this case, the block is constructed from overlapping statements of idea VI. The whole texture is laid out as shown in Figure 7.9:

Figure 7.9: orchestral block, mm.84–90

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>instr.</th>
<th>m.84</th>
<th>m.85</th>
<th>m.86</th>
<th>m.87</th>
<th>m.88</th>
<th>m.89</th>
<th>m.90</th>
<th>m.91</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>fl.</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(B)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B359</td>
<td>8210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cl.</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ob.</td>
<td>157B</td>
<td>A43</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(changes)</td>
<td>7B15</td>
<td>4A9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E.hn.</td>
<td>*3791</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
<td>BA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>rh IV: 999 9 111 1  555 5 AAA 6 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trb.vn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>V:</td>
<td>09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>va.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7; 6 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hn.</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>timp.</td>
<td></td>
<td>97 roll</td>
<td>~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~(+hp.&amp;cbn)~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bn.</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>046A</td>
<td>9321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>db.</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ta.</td>
<td>(8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The boldface strata in Figure 7.9 provide the essential contents of the block. The A–G dyad from the previous section continues in a sextuplet sixteenth note timpani roll (later joined by harp and contrabassoon; recall the Eb–Db roll found on sketch page 22 as described above). The six horns effect a statement of idea VI in augmentation (the first four notes are each seven eighth notes in duration) that stretches over the whole six-measure section.
as: <B359 8210>. Oboe and English horn combine in parallel minor sevenths in a statement of VI which displays a recurrent cross-metrical pattern of four-plus-three eighth notes; the total pattern of seven eighth notes thereby aligns with the augmented statement in the horns. (Note: the Particell gives the first note of the English horn as Eb, thus showing the 'proper' initial vertical seventh for the ostinato; in the score the note is modified to F, yielding an initial sixth, and the Eb becomes an introductory grace-note. The verticality at m.84 is thus wt1 subcollection 5–33, as shown in at the end of Ex.7.29; the grace-note Eb completes the wt1 collection.)

The left-hand column of the Figure also shows the pairs of dyads (in parentheses; all ic4, 'major thirds') that begin to sneak into the texture as anticipatory grace-note gestures. In a lovely rhythmic conceit, reiterations of the gestures gradually slow until they become measured entries of idea VI as the block progresses. Idea VI naturally shifts from one whole-tone subcollection to the other, a situation reinforced by the oboe-English horn doubling in parallel minor sevenths and by the chirping major thirds in the other parts. The oboe-English horn pair also keeps trading whole-tone orientations as the pattern shifts $T_1, T_2, T_3$ and is then modified to produce $T_6$ in m.87, where it also 'squares' the pattern with the meter (moving from seven to eight eighth notes). The clarinet and tuba/double bass statements of VI enter with metrically-syncopated half- and whole-note durations in m.87 and m.89, respectively. Between these entries the other VI-based parts enter in eighth notes at quarter-note lag: m.87, bassoon, <04 etc.>; m.88, viola, <48 etc.>; and m.88, beat 2, flute, <B3 etc.>. We will address the final elements of the texture summarized in Figure 7.9 (i.e., for trumpet, trombone and violin) in a moment; they anticipate the next section of the work. Berg's sketch for this orchestral block is transcribed in Example 7.35 (see next page).
Example 7.35: Transcription of Berg 13/ii, p.38, sketch for mm.82-91

Notes:
1. ballooned insert 2/4 measure
2. measure numbers: 87 overwrites 67
3. 83 overwrites 56
4. 80 changed into 86
5. “6” refers to changed pattern grouping
6. Ab?, crossed out
7. 78 or 79 overwritten
8. 75 overwritten by 79
Example 7.35 shows how some of the ideas for this orchestral block are prefigured on page 38 of sketchbook 13/ii. The sketch has several layers of revised measure numbers; this suggests that Berg had the idea for the passage before he knew where it would fit in, and had to keep bumping it to a position later in the form as other sketches expanded. At the top of the page, we find: the rhythmic profile of delta-2 as it occurs at m.83; and, following the suggested fermata, the contour for the main ostinato statement of idea VI, in the seven-eighth-notes-long pattern found in m.84ff (the oboe and English horn pair). Two additional ideas complete the texture of the orchestral block shown in Figure 7.9: the triplet sixteenth-note figures (on rhythmic motive IV) that are found on line 10 and the end of line 7 of the sketch, and the variant of idea V that is buried in line 9 of the sketch—pitch-precise with its version in the score! This combination of the trumpet arpeggiation <159A> (4–19 [0148]) in the interjecting rhythm of motive IV with the truncated statement of structural-framing marker-idea V <0987> (trombone and violin) signals the upcoming major formal subdivision at m.91.

In addition, the prominence of both delta-2 and VI in the preceding passages (mm.82–90)—which, together with V, made up the components of the original "Melodie" from the opening of the Marsch (mm.5–9)—makes the listener sense an impending return (some reworking of exposition material; perhaps even a full-blown recapitulation). This, as we know does not happen. Our initial experience of 'transition' (at m.81ff), revised to an anticipation of return—therefore, to the sense that we are actually in a 'retransition'—as ideas delta-2 and VI, and motives IV and V gradually reappear, becomes thwarted at m.91: a new tempo (Allegro energico III) arrives, and new material seizes control. The 'second half' of the Marsch begins.
SECOND HALF: *Allegro energico*—a breakout in three runs ...

The expectation of some form of recapitulation which is built up over mm.79–83 (the *Wozzeck* hallucination-motive quotation) and mm.84–90 (the layered ostinato texture based principally on idea VI) is dashed by the breakout of the ostensibly "new" material at m.91ff. From the documentary perspective, this 'Second Half' of the *Marsch* suffers from a remarkable paucity of sketches; and only a few minor compositional changes in the Particell warrant discussion. Analytically, it would of course be possible to continue to document—as we have for the 'first half' of the piece—many details of the surface pitch and pitch-class-set structure. A more fundamental task, however, is to account for the form-functional complexities of the second half and to explain the thematic transformational process that evolves as the *Marsch* presses to its conclusion. To that end, the reader may find it valuable at this point to review two earlier Figures: Figure 7.1, the *General Overview of the Form* (p.360) and Figure 7.4, the *First-half-second-half dichotomy of idea distribution* (p.378). For ease of reference, the relevant portion of Figure 7.1 is reproduced here as Figure 7.10; the contents of Figure 7.4 are briefly reconsidered in the paragraph that follows.

Figure 7.10: review of second-half formal design (from Figure 7.1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mm.</th>
<th>Formal features ...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>91–98</td>
<td><em>breakout: new strongly energetic tempo and tune (trumpets)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99–106</td>
<td>breath, continuation (violins)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107–120</td>
<td><em>relentless (<em>martellato</em>) rhythm, canonic thematic presentations</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121–126</td>
<td>motivic disintegration, but textural maximization, climax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127–135</td>
<td>catharsis broken by tempo fluctuations, thematic fragmentations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136–143</td>
<td>bariolage (to D) followed by chordal flux</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143–148</td>
<td>misted parenthetic recollection of big tune, grazioso, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149–154</td>
<td><em>cataclysmic fanfare drives to quasi-tonal arrival (on D2)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155–161</td>
<td>coda: slow swelling of thematic ideas and fateful flashback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162–170</td>
<td>dissolution to ticking (D), fogged-out thematic fragments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171–174</td>
<td>final fanfare: disastrous interjection, high swarming and drop</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 7.4 (p.378)—in a summary of the thematic tabulations of Figure 7.3 (pp.369–375)—showed that ideas 1 through 22 occur in the first half of the piece; ideas 23 through 31 occur in the second half of the piece. (The ideas are listed in DeVoto’s Table of Themes, his musical examples reproduced in our Figure 7.2, pp.363–365, and the thematic instances tabulated in Figure 7.3.) The first recapitulatory intrusions of ideas from the first half take place with the references to ideas 8, 2, and 5 near the Höhepunkt (m.126). More impressive reworkings of ideas from the Transition (2, 10–11, and 13) and Middle Section (15, 20–21, and 22) occur around mm.136 and 143, respectively. After a cataclysmic fanfare (mm.149–155) ends in a powerful and quasi-tonal arrival on D, the Coda features the re-emergence of cyclic ideas alpha and beta as well as recollections of subordinate thematic gestures (particularly 12, 15, and a neutralized 2).

Cyclic idea delta-2—an important component of the opening ‘Melodie’—recurred (it will be recalled) as the ‘tag’ at the end of the ‘Wozzeck’-quotation passage (m.82–83) near the end of the first half; it is similarly used as a signal, or portent, of closure (potential or actual) in the second half of the piece, notably following the Höhepunkt (m.126ff) and, again, at the Coda (m.155ff). It will be shown that its cyclic partner, delta-1—familiar as the opening Nebenstimme of Reigen and ‘officially’ present in thematic tabulations of the Marsch only at the border between the first sections and the beginning of the Middle Section (i.e., at m.46f)—plays a central, and gradually evolving role in a remarkable process of thematic transformation and form-functional innovation that constitutes one of the most compelling features of this part of the work. That process is initiated by the thematic complex about idea 23 (XXIII-1) that begins at m.91. A brief overview of the ‘three runs’ of that idea (at m.91, m.107, and—with several subsections in between—m.149) is provided in Example 7.36 (see next page).
Example 7.36: the ‘three runs’ of idea 23 (and intermediary subdivisions)

'1st run'

m. 91

XXIII-1

m. 107

XXIII-2

'2nd run'

XXIII-1 (aug.)

m. 111

XXIX (cf. Reigen, m. 37)

m. 117

VIII (canon a3)

m. 126. Hohepunkt; then

delta-2 (cf. m. 5-6)

m. 144

XXI ‘big tune’ (cf. m. 66)

XX ‘grazioso’ (cf. m. 62)

'3rd run'

m. 149

XXIII-1 (cf. delta-1)

... Coda: mm. 155–174
Example 7.36 shows the 'basic idea' of the thematic complex that begins with XXIII-1 at m.91. This is the first of 'three runs' at this thematic complex (the beginnings of these passages are noted with asterisks [*] in Figure 7.10). M.91ff is the 'first run' and it marks the beginning of the second half of the piece. After a developmental continuation (mm.99–107, not shown in Ex.7.36) a 'second run' begins at m.107. Example 7.36 shows the two principal strands of that 'second run': a statement of XXIII-1 in augmentation in the bass register Nebenstimme, and an inversional variant of the idea (designated XXIII-2 by DeVoto) in the Hauptstimme (horns). Note that, like the original idea at m.91, both voices begin with the arpeggiation of an 'augmented triad' (048 trichord); the lower part continues with the next segment of the idea, but the upper part omits this segment and proceeds directly to the third segment of the idea, exactly matching the pitches of that segment as they occurred in m.92. The 'third run' of the complex (shown at the bottom of the Example) does not take place until m.149, where it ushers in the Coda. Its initial descending arpeggiation is again a 048 trichord (with the same pcs as the version at m.91), but the rather terrifying marziale figure (for trumpets, horns, and trombones) gets hung up on modified reiterations of its incipit (and its final Bb–E tritone); in the process of this elaboration—as we will later demonstrate—the fanfare reveals itself as a transformation of cyclic idea delta-1.

Example 7.36 also illustrates the leading ideas of the main subsections that occur between the second and third runs. These subsections are briefly described here; further details will be give later on. M.111: with respect to the formal flow of the Marsch, this subsection (with leading idea XXIX) is experienced as 'parenthetical'; its larger purpose, however, is 'cyclic': it recalls (amongst other things) the subordinate theme of Reigen (m.37ff). M.117: we emerge from the formal parentheses of the preceding section with the return
of an idea from the first half of the Marsch, theme VIII, which dominates the texture in three-part canon. The passage begins to disintegrate motivically as it maximizes texturally, reaching the Höhepunkt in m.126. M.126: cyclic idea delta-2 returns, in a recollection of both the opening 'Melodie' (m.5–6) and the Wozzeck-quotation tag (m.82–83); development of that tag, and its fusion with the tail of idea VI (m.134) leads to the first 'bariolage' to the note D (m.135). Ex. 7.36 omits illustration of the next subsection, m.136ff, though it will be examined below: the subsection is largely chordal—a recollection (well-disguised!) of ideas X and XI (mm.25–28 and 37). M.144: another quasi-parenthetic passage occurs next, but one which is clearly recapitulatory; the Example shows two of its textural components, a contrapuntal combination of formerly successive ideas XX ('grazioso') and XXI ('big tune'). The passage drives towards, and is overridden by, the conclusive 'third run' beginning at m.149. The materials and formal subdivisions of the subsequent Coda (after the arrival in m.155) will be dealt with below, where the delta-1 pedigree of the final fanfare (idea XVIII, m.171–174) will also be revealed.

**Sketches.** Sketch sources for the second half of the Marsch are particularly scarce. One might go so far as speculate that an entire volume of sketches has gone missing; that, in any case, once Berg had decided to devote the second half of sketchbook 13/ii to the Wozzeck project, he had to find another place (a similar type of small-format sketchbook?) for any additional sketches for the second half of the Marsch and for last-composed Reigen. It is also possible—given that some tentative material for all three pieces is found in the Stadtbibliothek source—that another sketchbook of the A-Wn Berg 65/A-Wst 14.263 type (described in Chapter 3) once existed, and that it contained earlier efforts for Opus 6. Those few sketches for the second half of the Marsch that are available to us mostly concern the thematic complex about idea XXIII that characterizes the 'three runs'. These sketches will be
discussed together in a moment. Two additional sketches concern the chordal-orchestral sweep of m.136ff and the ‘Schluß’—the final fanfare, m.171–174; those will be discussed with their appropriate subsections below.

The identifying feature of the thematic complex about idea XXIII at mm.91, 107, and 149 is its triplet pickup. The ‘newness’ of the idea is explicitly acknowledged by Berg in a tentative sketch found on page 11 of sketchbook 13/ii, as transcribed in Example 7.37 (see next page). The top of the Example (lines 1 and 4) shows a continuation of fairly vague material from sketchbook page 10 (lines 1–2 and 4–5). (Further details concerning the contents of the surrounding pages are summarized in Figure 3.7, page 135.) The important entry on page 11 is found on line 6, and is marked “neu”. A triplet sixteenth-note pickup rhythm initiates a contour of descending arpeggiation that unmistakably represents idea XXIII-1. As the sketch continues, the half note and the repetition of the motive remind us of the ‘third run’ of XXIII found at m.149. The next triplet pickup, however, is in eighth notes rather than sixteenths, and this reminds us of the form of XXIII that begins the ‘second run’ at m.107. The two pairs of eighth notes which follow on sketch line 6 are possibly a displacement of the four-eighth-note developing segment that occurs after the incipit of the ‘first run’ of XXIII (m.91ff). The syncopation at the end of the line suggests the intrusion of marker idea V: in the score, such recurrence of V is carefully held back until just before the Höhepunkt (m.125–126); similarly, after the ‘third run’ of idea XXIII (m.149ff) is dissipated by the cyclic recollections (of alpha and beta) at the beginning of the Coda, idea V returns one final time, as the important “flashback” to the Präludium interjection (mm.160–161). In summary, though this tentative sketch does not present the “new” idea of the second half in any single well-formed way, it does seem to encapsulate its broader formal implications. (Line 8 regresses to the more non-descript profile of the material at the top of the page.)
Example 7.37: Transcription of Berg 13/ii, page 11; sketch for "new" idea XXIII

Notes:
1. connects to material on page 10
2. "new" incipit of idea XXIII
3. cf. four-eighth-note segments mm.91-92
4. cf. syncopation of idea V
5. returns to (more vague) material of top of page
Sketches for idea XXIII go back to even earlier sources. Berg's Notizhefte (A-Wn F 21 Berg 479; briefly described in Chapter 2, pp.62–63 and p.96 n26) contain a number of vaguely Marsch-like sketches. In particular, folios 26 and 26v–27 of Notebook 44 (11.8 x 7.5 cm; dark checkerboard cover; middle of 1913) contains a sketch in stick rhythms (with some, inaccurate, alphabetical note names) that is certainly the thematic complex at m.91ff. (Folio 27 continues with a sketch in purple pencil on a hand-drawn staff and the indication "Quartstufe", but the sketch cannot definitely be assigned.) A partial transcription is drawn in Figure 7.11:

Figure 7.11: From Notebook 44, folios 26 and 26v–27; sketch for m.91ff.

folio 26:

```
g | g e s a f e s a f e s g a u g
| d
```

folio 26v–27:

hand-drawn staff with different four-measure tonal idea, then ...
Other sketches for the idea XXIII complex are found in the Stadtbibliothek sketchbook gatherings (A-Wst MH 14.263/c; contents summarized in Figure 3.5, page 124.) In particular, page 29 of the sketchbook suggests the rhythm of the martellato figure (DeVoto's motive XXVIII) that accompanies the 'second run', m.107ff; as well as the registral creep of the later continuation of the 'first run' of idea XXVII (m.102f). Page 30 (the verso of page 29) contains the incipit dotted sixteenth-note pickup of idea XXIII (with some rough suggestions for its imitative treatment). As was reported in our history of Berg's early plans for a four-movements-in-one-movement work modeled on Schoenberg's Chamber Symphony (Chapter 2, p.62), the page clearly labels the idea as belonging to the projected "Finale" and (less clearly) advocates a "Mäßiges Marsch[tempo] [?]."

Page 31, transcribed in Example 7.38 (see next page), shows where things are headed: the bottom of the page indicates—"Thema übers ganze Orchester". The top of the page has the incipit in the form of the climactic 'third run' (m.149ff), though it continues at the end of the line with the rhythm of idea V, as did the 13/ii sketch (Ex.7.37, line 6). Also like the 13/ii sketch is the rather vague eighth-note figure at the beginning of line 3 (though perhaps the developing fragment of m.99ff is intended?). The figure at the end of the same line and its sequel below (see Berg's arrow pointing to line 6) model quite closely the pairing of ideas XXV and XXVII in the score at mm.102-103. (The indication "a" on both lines of the sketch likely indicates Berg's intention to repeat this idea-pair in the next measures, mm.104-105.) This succession XXV-XXVII becomes the 'new continuation' of the 'first run' (m.91ff; its original continuation was at m.99ff); it then drives us into the 'second run' of the thematic complex about idea XXIII, which begins at m.107ff.
Example 7.38: Transcription of A-Wst MH14.263/c, p.31; sketches m.149, m.102

Notes:

1. purple pencil
2. very light
3. “a” may refer to retained pitch or to intention to repeat idea pair: cf. m.102–103 and m.104–105
4. “Ten[uto]” or “Ten[or Posaune]” or, perhaps “Tr[ompet]” [unclear]
5. “steigernd” (mm.105–106)
6. “tremel[lo]” (cf. hp, m.107?; not pitches)
'FIRST RUN' (MM.91–106)

'First run': 'new asthmatic group', mm.91–98

Now that we have surveyed the formal design of the Second Half in its 'three runs', and have seen some of its often overlapping sketch sources, we are ready examine the thematic complex about idea XXIII in more detail. The 'first run' shows certain peculiarities of form-functional design: it is a "new thematic group" that might also be described as a "new asthmatic group". The 'asthmatic' opening of the first half of the Marsch was characterized by a build-up of texture constructed from various off-beat motivic wheezings. This second-half opening has its own formal hack.

This may best be shown by positing a hypothetically 'square' version of the thematic complex at m.91ff and then juxtaposing it to what actually happens. Example 7.39 (see next page) accomplishes this task: the top part of the Example shows (a) the "hypothetical, formally 'square' version"; the lower portion shows (b) the "actual, formally 'asthmatic'/'hyperventilated' version". Example 7.39(a) uses Berg's two-measure 'basic idea' [b.i.] (DeVoto's XXIII-1) to project a standard sentence-type 'presentation'. The basic idea is repeated (T1) in the next measures. A 'continuation' follows that fragments the idea in a sequential repetition that leads to a 'cadential idea' (Berg's own; XXIV-1 on DeVoto's Table). I am not suggesting that anyone—certainly not Berg—would allow things to proceed in such a mechanical fashion, but Ex.7.39(a) is a plausible representation of the normal form-functional model. Example 7.39(b), the real version, begins with the same basic idea, XXIII-1. But rather than repeat the idea, Berg follows with XXIV-1: a contrasting idea [c.i.] which is manifestly cadential in profile. This idea is allowed no respite: it is immediately overlayed by interjection idea XXV, which also shows cadential contour.
Example 7.39: ‘New asthmatic group'; hypothetical and actual versions of m.91ff

(a) Hypothetical, formally square version of XXIII-I

(b) Actual, formally 'asthmatic'/‘hyperventilated’ version
When basic idea XXIII-1 begins to repeat in the next measure (m.95), we begin to think it may be a ‘consequent’: that is, we think that the thematic complex XXIII-1-XXIV-1-XXV, as b.i. and c.i. (with added interjection) might represent a somewhat peculiar ‘antecedent phrase’ in a periodic (rather than a sentence-like) structure. But this consequent soon becomes congested: rather than simply follow the repeated b.i. with some stronger form of the c.i., the passage continues with developing fragments of XXIII-1 in stretto-like overlap (DeVoto’s XXVI); it presents these simultaneously with a stretched and scuttled variant of XXIV-1; and it stops the process not with a cadence, but with the ‘breathless hyperventilation’ of the caesura at m.98-99. The composer emphasized this ‘hyperventilate formal quality’ by ballooning m.96 into the Particell (Berg 12, folio 21v): that is, the ‘consequent’ b.i. of m.95 originally went in a fairly square manner directly to the fragmentation of m.97f; but, in adding m.96, Berg inserted a slightly-varied tail-segment and—more important—the simultaneously stated pickups of ideas XXIII-1 and XXIV-1. As a result, what was originally only a slightly stifled, modified ‘consequent’ in m.95f now suddenly coughs and hyperventilates its way into formal breathlessness in mm.96-98.

Though Example 7.39 addresses the characteristic form-functional complexities of the ‘first run’, it does not do full justice to its textural complexities: its motivic and harmonic pitch-class structure. Some of these matters are summarized in Example 7.40 (see page 501, below). The Example gives only the ‘antecedent’ and the beginning of the ‘consequent’. The pc-set structure is obviously quite variegated and the reader’s attention is drawn to only a few important correspondences. Basic idea XXIII-1 begins with the descending arpeggiation of a 048 trichord (omission of the ‘appoggiatura-like’ C5 [m.91, b.3] yields the familiar 4–19 [0148] as <A62(0)B>). This ‘augmented-triad’ (and 0148) incipit also characterizes the variants of delta-2 (m.44) and
delta-1 (m.46) that set up the beginning of the Middle Section proper (and marked the end of the Episode), so the astute listener will note that idea XXIII-1 begins to reveal its delta pedigree right away. The inversionally derived XXIII-2 is the bass Nebenstimme in m.93–94; its incipit shows the same 048/0148 arpeggiation; its tail shows the ‘gapped whole-tone’ SC 4–25 [0268] also found at the end of the original antecedent, XXIII-1. The same SC is also tacked onto accompanying idea ‘beta’, which appears for the first time in the Marsch at this point (m.93–94). The ‘chromatic run’ at the beginning of c.i. XXIV-1 (m.92–93) picks up ic1 pc components from both XXIII-1 and beta.

The initial harmony beneath the tune reveals the extended-tonal allusion to D: a “D minor triad with added sixth”, this is—here more forcefully—the same “Märchenhand” chord that was softly lobbed into Präludium m.48. The second chord (with a quasi-recapitulatory allusion to the motive-1 rhythm) yields SC 4–18 [0147], which SC is also reflected in the bass line beneath the basic idea (mm.91–92; <277A1). The third chord is a quartal sonority (4–23 [0257]); its Präludium-familiar alternative (gapped fourth-chord SC) 4–22 [0247] is the tag at the end of c.i. XXIV-1 (m.93–94).

Interjection idea XXV (in total, instancing SC 6–22 [012468]) begins with the all-interval tetrachordal SC 4–29 [0137] and ends with wt1 subcollections (5–33 as <B9517>). SC 4–29 is the upper voice of motive beta (in the preceding measure); the wt1 subcollection is also found in the last chord under XXIII-1 (m.92, b.3), in the incipit of XXIII-2 (m.93) and in the tetrachordal tail of them both (m.92 and m.94). In the consequent phrase, the tail of the idea is slightly modified (m.96—this is Berg’s Particell insert) and a varied pc-set structure thereby results: notably, though SC 4–18, as the initial segment of the tail may recall chord 2 (m.91; same pcs), antecedent wt1 subset 4–25 is, in the consequent, traded for ‘diminished seventh’ tetrachord 4–28 [0369] (in the ultimately important form <71 4A>). (See Example 7.40, next page.)
Example 7.40: 'First run'—antecedent and beginning of consequent, mm.91–96
'First run': 'developmental continuation', mm.99–106

The material in m.98 fails to bring the period to a cadence. The pickup on Ab5 (violins, m.98) gasps for breath before moving on to a suddenly slower (plötzlich etwas zurückhaltend) developmental continuation. The motivic model for that continuation is DeVoto's XXVI, which is locally derived from the four-eighth-notes segment of XXIII-1 (m.91). The core of the underlying harmony is expressed by the harp arpeggiation of mm.99–102: an alternation of SC 4–19 [0148] (initially as <73B6>) and SC 4–13 [0136] (beta's lower voice, but not its contour; initially as <07A1>) "creeps" chromatically upward and then merges with the quartal sonorities (all SC 4–23 [0257]) of motive XXIV-2 at m.101–102. DeVoto has addressed the "creeping" qualities of this passage in some detail. (See DeVoto 1984, Ex.24, p.439 for a six-stave reduction of mm.105–106; in Berg's Particell, folio 26, the passage requires nine staves. DeVoto 1984, 438–442 discusses "creeping" in the Marsch; DeVoto 1985 [published version 1991, passim] deals generally with creeping as a voice-leading phenomenon in Berg's work.)

DeVoto's XXIV-2 label for the figure in lower brass and strings is based on its contour: the tail of XXIV-1 (m.92) is a five-note string <98351> with contour <32410> [we label 0 as lowest, 4 as highest element in the contour]; this same contour repeats in XXIV-2 (m.101), and again as XXIV-3 (horns, m.102ff). The first and last of these three variants [a fourth will be noted later] both begin with the characteristic pickup rhythm of motive I; yet the pitch-class and set-class structure all three is quite distinct. An even looser relation may obtain in the plodding quarter-note pace of the lower strings in m.99ff. The passage somehow suggests idea X to me, with subsequent XXIV-2 taking over the quasi-cadential role (though not the contour) of idea XI. However, apart from the rough rhythmic correspondence, the only thing that remotely "matches" is the initial vertical abstract set-class, 5–22 [01478] as <6B3707> at
m.99, which is also found in the continuation of X at m.27 (though quite differently disposed, as <80493>). Ultimately, closer analytical examination of such passages often suggests that one's perception of their relation may be close to groundless.

Apart from the generalized creeping identified by DeVoto in mm.102–106, the end of the ‘first run’ has some remarkable form-functional qualities. Idea XXV, first heard tacked onto c.i. XXIV-1 at the end of the antecedent phrase in m.94—as a kind of interjected cadential cough—now changes functions: it becomes the initial motive in a model-sequence pair: XXV–XXVII (mm.102–103, 104–105). (Recall that this pairing was anticipated in the Stadtbibliothek sketch transcribed in Ex.7.38, p.496, above.) The ‘whiplash tail’ of idea XXVII has its rhythmic roots at the top of idea VIII, back in mm.12–13. The fragmented development of that tail also recalls earlier materials by chaining together 014 cells: see, for example, the oboe-viola, and clarinet-violin pairings in m.106. The overall textural din then breaks out in the ‘second run’.

'Second Run' (mm.107–126)

'Second run': driving forward and looking back, mm.107–110

The beginning of the ‘second run’ drives forward with a fateful fortissimo combination of ideas XXIII-1 and XXIII-2. The first is presented in augmentation in the bass; after announcing the section with an elongated version of the rhythm-IV pickup, the idea immediately switches to Nebenstimme status. (The ‘fateful’ quality of this gesture may in part be due to a broader musical semiotic: <GGG Eb> at the beginning of XXIII-1; Beethoven’s Fifth?.) The beginning of the ‘second run’ is shown in Example 7.41 (see next page).
Example 7.41: 'Second run'—driving forward; beginning of texture, m.107ff
(Comments on Example 7.41 continued.) Its partner, XXIII-2, an inversional derivation of the same idea, was first heard as bass Nebenstimme in mm.94–95; here it becomes the Hauptstimme—for six horns ff. The relentless character of the passage comes from the maniacal *martellato* string chords (DeVoto's idea XXVII; executed to the [perceptually-regrouped] rhythm of motive I, underscored by field drum). The *martellato* chords alternate 048 and 0148 sonorities; their pitch-class contents interact cleverly with the surrounding thematic materials.

The lower woodwinds execute 'beta' as an additional accompaniment figure; beta is preceded by, and alternates with, a descending figure for piccolos and xylophone in the same rhythmic pattern. This seems to be a 'loose mirror' (or as DeVoto [1984, 401] suggests, a "quasi-retrograde") of the beta flourish, but closer examination reveals that the upper voice repeats SC 4–19 [0148] (initially as piccolo 1 and 2 <5084>) over lower-voice SC 4–8 [0156] (initially as piccolo 3 and 4 <6721>) rather than beta's characteristic SC combination of 4–29 over 4–13. Therefore, despite the rhythmic identity and metrical complementarity of the figures, the piccolo-xylophone idea is modeled on the incipit of idea XXIII (and delta) rather than on beta. The rhythmic disposition of the xylophone part differs slightly from that of the piccolo pair. This is not shown in Ex.7.41. The xylophone part is a sextuplet which consists of the upper piccolo line plus the melodic reiteration of the final dyad of the piccolo pair; thus, initially <508414> (cf. the piccolo listings above). This adjustment was probably made for idiomatic reasons [though one can not always vouch for Berg's grasp of the more esoteric instruments, including xylophone and harp!], but the result may be instructively compared with the horn Hauptstimme that immediately follows: xylophone <508 414> and horns (XXIII-2) <915 8713 9>. The interaction is quite subtle: though the xylophone part projects SC 5–21 [01458] and the horns quite different SC 5–13
[01248], both figures begin with an instance of SC 4–19 [0148] in inversionally-related forms; furthermore, the registral extrema of the xylophone part (pcs 5 and 1, sounding F6 and C#5) become the common pcs in the horn Hauptstimme. The interaction continues in a slightly different manner at the beginning of the next measure; the xylophone-piccolo combination begins with Ab over A (pc8 over pc9); the horn segment moves from pc8 to pc9, as <8 (713) 9>.

The bass Nebenstimme (XXIII-1 in augmentation) ends on F# in m.110; through registral manipulation the note is approached via a non-contiguous chromatic descent (A–Ab–G in m.108) and via the normal 4–25 [0268] ‘tail’ figure of the basic idea with its interlocking tritones (here <4A06). (We will have occasion to review this ‘setup’ of the F# when we consider the structural voice-leading approach of the bass voice to the Höhepunkt in m.126, below.) The arrival on F# is signalled by another interjection of a cadential idea (for trombones). (See the upper part of the bottom staff in m.110 of Ex.7.41.) DeVoto identifies this interjection as XXIV-1 (1984, 401), no doubt because of its triplet tail; but the syncopated entry of the idea suggests a synthesis of XXV and XXIV. Moreover, the original version of XXV (at m.94) began with SC 4–29 [0137] as <0B95 17>. SC 4–29 is normally associated with the upper voice of beta. Here in m.110, the synthesized XXV-XXIV idea begins with 4–13 [0136] as <542B 760>; SC 4–13 is normally associated with the lower voice of beta. Actually, a beta motive is stated simultaneously with the interjection; its lower voice shares two pcs (as <B281> for clarinet and oboe) with the interjection.

Meanwhile, the remarkable continuation of the Hauptstimme (mm.108–110) employs linkage technique, rhythmic compression, and—via the reintroduction of chained 014 cells—interlocking 0148 referents (see the annotations on Ex.7.41): all of which serves to set up the next subsection.
‘Second run’ [cont’d]: driving forward and looking back, mm.111–126

The passage from m.111 until just before the Höhepunkt in m.126 is bound together by an F pedal point. As DeVoto states: “The most obvious [pitch] centricities in the Marsch are those organized by pedal point. The F pedal near the beginning (measure 15ff.) originates with [motive] IV; why it should be associated, for any reason other than pitch-class identity, with the long F pedal at measures 111–124, is not clear (1984, 432).” The pedal F may indeed be associated with IV: a development that rhythmic motive (and of motive I) takes place throughout the passage on timpani. Since, as was suggested in our previous section, the pedal F is approached from F# (m.110), and since that F# was, in part, approached by a non-contiguous chromatic descent from A (m.108), we might also speculate that the prominence of the note has a broader structural-motivic purpose. Specifically, it is possible that a large-scale projection of idea V is underway. In its original Präludium form (mm.11–12), the tag of V is (F#–A)–F#–F–E–C#. Here in the Marsch, the approach to the Höhepunkt projects the following bass motion: A (possibly, from m.108), F# (m.110), F (m.111), and E (m.124–125) moving chromatically to C# (m.126). Such an interpretation adds credence to our feeling of the “portentousness” of the “flashback” to motive V (in its original form) that occurs later in the Coda (m.160–161): the flashback also functions as a ‘compression’ of this earlier large-scale bass motion.

One is still left wondering why the F pedal lasts as long as it does. (Of course, F is the central pitch in the original configuration, but that hardly justifies such longevity.) The purpose, it seems to me, is more ‘formal’ than ‘harmonic’: the pedal point gives the whole passage a feeling of pre-climactic stasis and build-up, but it also marks the contents as ‘parenthetic’. With idea XXIX (m.110, last beat; only its pickup was shown in Ex.7.41) the Marsch begins to ‘look back’, as well as drive forward. See Example 7.42 (next page).
Example 7.42: 'Second Run' [cont'd]—'looking back'; m.111ff

(a) M. m.111

(b) R. m.37 (S.T.)

(c) P. m.28-30 (S.T.)

(d) M. m.113

(e) M. m.115

(f) M. m.116 link VIII

(g) M. m.122 (XXIX)

(XXIX) Höhepunkt (m.126)
Example 7.42 (previous page) summarizes some of the subtle cross-references built into the principal ideas of the 'parenthetic passage' of m.111ff. Idea XXIX, Ex.7.42(a), though ostensibly new, sounds strikingly familiar. DeVoto (1984, 400) has shown that the beginning of the idea closely resembles (what we have called) the Subordinate Theme of Reigen, m.37f. Perhaps understandably, DeVoto appends the query: "is this comparison meaningful?" (The comment is reproduced in his Table of Themes, p.355 of the present study.) I would respectfully submit that such comparisons—uncomfortably loose and longe-range though they may be—lie at the heart of this passage.

Ex.7.42(b) shows the Reigen comparison. An even more remote connection is suggested in Ex.7.42(c): to the Subordinate Theme of the Präludium, mm.28–30; its modified sequential continuation is shown on the next staff of the Example. That should be compared with Ex.7.42(d): the continuation of the Marsch passage, m.113–114; its modified extension is shown on the next staff down. That is then connected to idea XXIV-4 (m.115, as identified by DeVoto); see Ex.7.42(e). A kind of rhythmic overlap marks this idea: all of the preceding examples featured extended 'upbeats' leading to an appoggiatura-like gesture. Here, because that gesture is no longer stepwise, the idea seems to begin afresh on the downbeat. Tritones abound (<5B> ... <93> <4A>), and with the explicit linkage of Bb–C–D to Bb–C–Db in m.116–117, we begin to emerge from the parentheses. (In the score, one also notes the increased registral activity of the F pedal at this point.)

DeVoto has adequately described the various canonic manipulations that take place throughout this section: idea XXIX against itself in syncopated triplet eighths (m.111ff) and diminished sextuplets (m.114); idea XXIII-2 in canon à3 at half note lag (m.115ff); XXIV-4 (incompletely, m.117ff); and—its first entry shown as our Ex.7.42(f)—idea VIII, as Hauptstimme, in canon à3.
This clear return of idea VIII, and its canonic domination of the texture from mm.117–120, is the strongest ‘recapitulatory act’ we have had so far. But because it happens over a pedal point, we are left expecting more.

The next passage (Zeit lassen, m.121–126) has a quality of reculer pour mieux sauter. It steps back—only to switch from ‘canon’ to ‘convention’. The link which was shown in Ex.7.42(f) that connected XXIV-4 with the beginning of canonic VIII is also used (at the end of another statement of XXIV-4; upper woodwinds, m.119–120) to link m.120 to the beginning of m.121. This time the link is downward: D–C–Bb becomes D–C–B. The latter motive then serves as pickup to the incipit of XXIII-2 (trumpets 3 and 4, m.121): <20 B3 37>. (Note that the order of pcs <B37> reverses that which began this ‘second run’ <777 3 B> at m.107.) However, the complete idea does not materialize. Instead, it is ‘neutralized’ by an upward chromatic scalar motion (trumpet 2, m.121, b.3) which, in turn, sets up the scalar creeping idea DeVoto identifies as XXX. The idea combines two interval-cycle segments; it consists of a descending chromatic tetrachord (ic1) in the rhythm of motive I followed by a wt0 scalar descent (ic2) in sixteenth notes: <8765 420A8> (m.122). Against idea XXX, we find one final allusion to XXIX (violins, m.122–123; not identified as anything in particular by DeVoto). As is shown in Ex.7.42(g), the figure moves immediately to the structural-framing statements of motives I1 and V that mark the Höhepunkt. Amidst the general thickening of XXX, cadential interjection XXV and the ‘whiplash tail’ of XXVII also return to contribute to the density and din.
NOTE TO USERS

Page(s) not included in the original manuscript are unavailable from the author or university. The manuscript was microfilmed as received.
The final delta-2 tag is then suddenly subjected to developmental repetitions. Specifically, while idea XXX is treated to an "elegant wedge" (DeVoto 1984, 440) in the complementary rhythmic layouts of three scalar ‘blocks’ for horns and pizzicato viola and cello (mm.130–133), the B–D# third of the delta tag in m.130 (violins) is decorated “from without” (with an A#) rather than “from within” (with C). This changes the 014 tag to 015. Several accel.–rit. repetitions of this newly-modified delta-2 tag (<A B3>, <0 14>) and its downward answering partner (oboe and celesta: <A 8B> [013], <2 15> [014]) allow a direct link to a fragment of idea VI (m.133, violins)—<5 6A 04 3 987>.

(Note, once again, the succession delta-2–VI.) Its final descending 012 <987> is immediately answered by an ascending 012 in trumpet <456>. The violins continue the fragment with <0BA 1> and the flutes complete the gesture with an isolated D4 <pc2>. (The connection of violins to flutes produces another 014 cell as <A1 2>. This recollection of 014s is seconded by the recurrence of cyclic motive alpha in parallel thirds in trombone and horn, m.134–135.) The stumble onto D4 in m.134 (flutes) is the first of four directed motions to D in the final sections of the piece; in this first case, the innocent flute D is immediately seized by timpani (XIII <2 4A> etc.) and a string “bariolage” (#1).

This passage and the remarkable ‘chordal flux’ that follows in m.136ff are anticipated in a sketch found on page 40 of 13/ii. It is transcribed in Example 7.43 (see next page). The top line of the sketch shows the intrusion of the delta-2 idea and the fragmented development of its tag. Line 3, marked “Ende”, shows idea VI (a tone higher in the sketch than it is in m.133). The stumbling fragments follow (marked with bracket ‘b’); and the bariolage is evident at the end of the line. Lines 5–7—marked “Wogend” and “sehr schwung”—outline m.136ff: the rhythms of ideas X and XI are discernible on line 5; the presence of bracketed motive ‘b’ (line 7) suggests that Berg intended its continuation beneath (or within) the chordal flux.
Example 7.43: Transcription of Berg 13/ii, p.40: sketch for mm.129–135, 136ff

Notes:  ① "III" probably intended; extra half-stroke  ② overwrites margin  ③ page stroked through  ④ very faint entries  ⑤ "vom Anfang": not done—cf. bass idea VII, m.9–10 followed by VIII, m.11f (cont’d top of p.41)
The last system of the sketch indicates that Berg anticipated a substantial recapitulation of material at this point in the piece. The "X" and "vom Anfang" indications refer to idea VII: the bass passage from mm.9–10, which idea—as we noted in our original discussion of DeVoto's Table of Themes, p.356, above—in fact, never recurs. Berg's "X" cross-references all the way back to the original passage on sketchbook page 14, the messy sketch of the complete texture of the opening (Exx.7.7(a) and 7.8(a), pp.393 and 395, above). Ex.7.43 shows that idea VII was to lead directly to VIII (seen in the last measure of the sketch) as it did in near the opening of the work; in sketchbook 13/ii, the next few notes of idea VIII are continued on the next page (not shown; p.41, line 1, the top G# marked "lange" "etc").

'Portents of closure', part 1 [cont'd]—chordal flux, m.136ff

DeVoto (1980, 103–104; and 1984, 432–435) has discussed in some detail the remarkably disguised recapitulation of (what we have called) Transition measures 25–28 in the chordal flux of mm.136–139; similarly, the recurrence of the "harmonic pattern" of mm.37–38 (the close of the Transition) in m.140. There is no need to recapitulate DeVoto's discussion here, though we will second his conclusion: "It is not to be wondered that merely to notice the connection between these measures, though analysis makes it obvious, is likely a matter of lucky accident (1984, 434)." The passage concludes with additional appearances of ideas XIII (trumpet and xylophone) and alpha (horns and trombones), and a more registrally-elaborate bariolage (#2) to D. In m.142, the bariolage is broken off by a two-chord swoop: though quite heterophonically partitioned, the progression is essentially SC 6–22 [012468] as \(<3 159 2 7>\) to 6–21 [023468] as \(<6 048 3 + 2>\) (the timpani D). (See the harp part in m.142; the total content of the first chord is actually SC 7–33 [012468A], the wt1 collection [including the trumpet B] plus D.) The progression 6–22 to
6–21 is also found at the beginning of this chordal flux subsection; the 6–22 in m.142 (<3 159 2 7>) is a T2-transposition of the chord in m.136 (essentially <1 37B 0 5>). The bass tone at m.136 is C#, at m.142 Eb. Like the registral extrema of the Höhepunkt (Eb7 and C#1), the passage thus circumnavigates D, a fact confirmed earlier in the two D bariolages and here (m.142–143) by the timpani wallops (with hammer blow #2). It is tempting to try and establish some precise relationship between the rhythm of this timpani interjection and the ‘Hauptrhythmus’ of the Präludium and Reigen but the Marsch passage is, by comparison, a spasmodic coughing fit—albeit continental in scale.

**Berg and Zauberberg: a poetic analogue for the final sections of the Marsch.**

The full score of the Marsch is dated at Trahütten, the 23rd of August, 1914. This is the date of the Battle of Mons, the first contact between English and German forces, and the highpoint of a spectacular August advance by the Germans that ended at the Marne in early September. It is difficult today for us to hear Berg’s work without a deep sense of historical moment. If Wozzeck is, in part, Berg’s sometimes autobiographical anatomy of military experience, then the final piece of Opus 6—to borrow George Perle’s adjective (1980, 18)—is the war’s “marche macabre” premonition.

As we examine the final sections of the Marsch, it is poetically instructive to place against them another famous description of those times. In Thomas Mann’s *The Magic Mountain* (*Der Zauberberg*), the character Hans Castorp, the personification of youthful European naïveté, goes to a mountain-top sanatorium—actually, it is called the Berghof!—to visit his cousin Joachim and to partake of a three-week cure (recall Helene Berg’s stay at Carlsbad). He ends up staying for seven years, wrenched down from the thin air of the mountains, and back to the reality of the “flat-land” only by the declaration of war. Though Mann’s work dates from 1924, it concerns exactly
the pre-war period embodied in Berg’s Marsch. Indeed, the mood swings and character shifts of the end of the Marsch—from disembodied reminiscence through fateful forward drive, from nostalgic yet suspenseful waiting to inevitable catastrophe—are captured with uncanny correspondence in a number of descriptive passages near the end of Mann’s novel. These passages are supplied as quasi-epigraphs to our examination of the final sections of the Marsch. We begin with the extraordinary formal moment that immediately follows hammer blow #2 and the timpani wallops in m.142–143.

**Mm.143–148: “weird chords” and “parenthetic recapitulations”**

*What is it? Where are we? Whither has the dream snatched us?*  
*Twilight, rain, …*  


The reader/listener is invited to contemplate in parallel Marsch mm.143–148 and Mann’s description of disorientation upon returning from the rarefied atmosphere of the mountains to the twilight of the flat-land. The passage is laid out in Example 7.44 (see next two pages). Its first striking feature is the weirdly-orchestrated chord on the last beat of m.143. The chord feels like ’nothing on earth’: “What is it? Where are we? Whither has the dream [the nightmare of the previous passage] snatched us?” Through the ’sonorous twilight’, it is difficult to perceive that the chord has several tones in common with the first flux chord in m.136. (The m.136 chord, SC 6-22, essentially reads $<1 73 \text{B37.05}>$; this chord, the tuba note included, is SC 6–48, and reads $<A \text{53.B70}>$; the common tones yield SC 5–30.) The pairing of the chords recalls idea X from the Transition, m.25; and from the flux at m.136; and the top line of the progression, pcs $<08\text{AB}>$, yields the same SC 4–2[0124] as in the earlier passages (m.25 $<6245>$, m.136 $<5134>$). Otherwise, only SC 5–26 recurs (here differently disposed): m.146; m.25, b.3; m.137 (inside 6–21).
Example 7.44: "weird chords" and "parenthetic recapitulations," mm.143–149
Example 7.44 [cont'd]: mm.143–149
(Comments on Ex.7.44 continued). Apart from the weird chords, the principal feature of this passage is the recapitulation of theme XXI (the 'big tune' from m.66ff; 8vb, English horn). Theme XX (the 'grazioso tune' from m.62ff; T7 8vb, cello) is recapitulated simultaneously. Thus, the two relatively self-sufficient formal units from the later portion of the Middle Section are contrapuntally combined below the parenthetic twilight haze of the weird chords. At the bottom of the texture, the tuba also manages a recapitulation of Episode theme XV-1 (from m.39, T4 and down three octaves); a continuation follows, based loosely on the Episode c.i. (m.40). Bassoons and oboes fill the middle of the texture with trichordally-enhanced fragments of motive II.

The second page of Ex.7.44 (p.518) shows the continuation of these textural strata. The bass line continues with variant Episode idea XV-2 (cf. m.41, also T4 here) from m.147(end)-148. At the top of the texture, the potential juxtaposition of fundamentally chordal ideas X and XXII is partially realized: we have already discussed how the preceding weird chords relate to idea X; in m.147-148, the violins have the top line of idea XXII (with the same pitches of its original statement, m.77-78). Melodically, this shows idea XXII in its role as a structural terminator. The vertical sonority on the last beat of m.147, however, models neither XXII nor X; instead, it instances the diatonic hexachord (6-32) as stacked fourths. This collection is then horizontalized in idea XVII (bassoon, m.147-148; the dashed lines on Ex.7.44 help track the Nebenstimme through the texture). The end of the stratum with idea XX (Ex.7.44, line 6) disintegrates into trichordal motives; the cascading sixteenth motion in the upper register (line 1) is somewhat loosely based on the (much stronger) cadential descent of idea XX in m.65-66. The end of XXI (like its predecessor in m.70-71) creeps chromatically upward through C and C# (m.148). In its earlier incarnation XXI moved to a wt1
subcollection <37B1> (m.71, b.3), and was taken over by idea XIII (m.71–72; hn. and timp. <571>); here, the wt1 subcollection arrives at the beginning of m.149, but the C–C# creep at the top of XXI also finds a new goal: the D contained in the incipit of the fanfare marziale <AAA 6 2> (m.149). And this brings us to the climactic ‘third run’ at idea XXIII.

'THIRD RUN' (MM.149–155)

‘Third run: ‘fanfare marziale’, mm.149–155

Fiery glow of the overcast sky, ceaseless booming of heavy thunder; the moist air rent by a sharp singing whine, a raging, swelling howl as of some hound of hell, that ends its course in a splitting, a splintering and sprinkling, a coruscation; by groans and shrieks, by trumpets blowing fit to burst, by the beat of a drum coming faster, faster.


As twilight turns to terror, the disorienting parenthetic recapitulations of the preceding passage swell forward and give way to a final break out of idea XXIII-1. In this ‘third run’, the delta-1 pedigree of XXIII is revealed. The passage is shown in Example 7.45 (see next page). The incipit of the idea (for fff horns, trumpets, and trombones)—<AAA 6 2>—gets hung up. It repeats, its last note creeping downward: <AAA 6 1>. A third attempt creeps another semitone <AAA 6 0>, the end now a tritone drop <60>. The momentum and rhythmic compression causes further creeping, down to A <pc9> and a further tritone drop <93>. From that tritone drop, the idea slithers down chromatically to a truly ominous tritone drop, Bb–E (<A4>). In the Example, the principal notes of this action are marked with asterisks [*]. Taken together, these asterisks produce the following pc string: <A62103BA4>. This string is delta-1 in exactly the form found in m.45–46 (harp and trombone).
Example 7.45: ‘Third run’—fanfare marziale, mm.149–155
Even the contours of the two passages match if the intervening repeated tones and smooth chromatic motions of XXIII-1 are removed. (Idea XXIII-1 spans an extra octave; we need only move the asterisked notes leading up to the Eb3 in m.151 down an octave for the pitch and contour match to be complete.) This extraordinary transformation was prefigured at the end of the Episode; i.e., at the conclusion of the Exposition–Counter-Exposition–Transition–and Episode and just before the beginning of the Middle Section proper of the piece. The “normal forms” of delta-1 and delta-2 begin with the arpeggiation of ‘diminished trichords’ [036]. For example, delta-1, is first heard as the Reigen foreshadow in Präludium mm.44–46: \(<41A87A652>\); delta-2 is familiar from the Retransition (m.105) of Reigen but also from the opening “Melodie” complex of the Marsch (mm.6–8) as: \(<0368964326>\). But at the end of the Episode, delta-2 appears with an ‘augmented trichord’ [048] as incipit (m.44–45, horn): \(<37B21A876(A)>\); and is immediately answered by delta-1 with the same 048 incipit (m.45–46, harp and trombone, linked to the preceding): \(<A62103BA4>\).

These two modified forms of cyclic complex delta are notable because they are linked together and because they occur at an important formal juncture in the Marsch. 048 incipits are not a feature of materials through the various subdivisions of the Middle Section (m.46ff), Codetta (m.76ff), and (Re)transitions (mm.79 and 84ff); but they become a prominent and distinctive feature of the principal thematic complex of the Second Half—idea XXIII in both its downward (XXIII-1) and upward (XXIII-2) configurations. The fanfare marziale is the third and final run at the idea XIII, and the idea is developed in a way that makes its derivation from cyclic theme delta explicit.

Otherwise, the beginning of Ex.7.45 shows how the lower parts consist of two strata: three creeping ic2 descents in eighth notes shift from wt1 to wt0 and back; and an ic1 creep (wt1 at the next deeper level) connects F2–A1. The
end of Example 7.45 shows some of the prominent pitch-class structural features of the wild trombone arpeggiations in mm.152–154. The trichordal, quartal, and tritonal aspects of these configurations are fairly apparent. The annotations summarize important tetrachordal occurrences. (Consider, for example that 4–22 and 4–26 are both prominent 'gapped fourth chord types' in the Präludium, and that SC 4–27, as either a 'dominant or half-diminished seventh chord type' represents delta-2, the second chord of Reigen, and the "Märchenhand"-added sixth sonority.)

The obsessive reiterations of tritone Bb–E are particularly important: this tritone will also end the whole work (in m.174). More locally, the tritone, the bass motion, and the final segment of the trombone line, conspire to produce a powerful quasi-tonal cadence to D in m.155. Ex.7.45 indicates that the bass motion Ab–A–D (or G#–A–D) invokes tonal scale-degree functions #4–5–1. The sustained Eb invokes b2. And the trombone line, with its E–Bb–(passing through C to Db (or C#), invokes 2–b6–(7)–#7–1. The underlying tonal progression would be a 'pre-dominant syntax' that combines aspects of "bII" and "#IV" and a 'dominant syntax' of "V" (with both normal and lowered fifth [E and Eb] and minor ninth [Bb], as well as the leading tone [here enharmonically expressed]). The final move to 'tonic syntax' ("I"; pedaltone D) is undermined by the addition of Cb's on harp (m.155 downbeat). This is of course reminiscent of 'deceptive' casting of the root of "VI" (here B-natural) beneath the tonic. (The Particell [folio 31'] shows m.155 as a ballooned insert, ostensibly because Berg decided he needed more space to allow cyclic ideas alpha and beta a more gradual re-entry.) Layered atop this suddenly-tonal syntax is a continuing trichordal motivic play: the bass instances 016 (as <3 over 89> as well as <892>), and the trombone line implies several possible 014 trichords across the cadential border (014 as <9A1>, <A12>, and <AB2>).
'Portents of closure', part 2: Coda (mm.155-174)

Ah, a signpost! Useless, though, to question it, even despite the half-dark, for it is shattered, illegible. East, west? It is the flat-land, it is the war.

(Mann [1924] 1969, 712-713).

The cadential arrival in m.155 marks the beginning of the Coda. The tonal focus of that arrival is unmistakably D minor. Yet the familiar "signpost" is "shattered"; made "illegible" soon after the point of arrival, not only because the harp subterfuge scumbles the border, but also because the materials which follow appear to step out of the frame, to move away from the forcefully established goal. Though the centricity of D has been well prepared: through 'circumnavigation' (by the Eb's and C#'s at the Höhepunkt and chordal flux), through blunt reiteration (at the bariolages and timpani wallop), and, finally, through the extended-tonal harmonic and voice-leading manipulations of the fanfare marziale—we are not sure why we are here.

Portents of closure, part 2: cycles and flashbacks, flickers and ticks

The ensuing alpha, beta, delta and other thematic fragments, the flashback to the Präludium, are like the familiar faces and mixed emotions of the Mann's young soldiers paused at the edge of the wood, awaiting their attack orders—as harp and celesta tick tense time away. (Cf. Mann [1924] 1969, 714).

Cycles. The layers of the Coda begin to establish themselves at m.155. Bass pedaltone D begins to build on rhythmic motive IV; harp Cb reiterates rhythmic motive 3. (Both are assisted by percussion: bass drum and large tam tam; as well, the snare drum contributes to the ongoing textural ebb and rumble.) Cyclic ideas alpha and beta return at this point in horns and trombones; in the score, both ideas are built up gradually in Berg's additive style (recall the beginnings of all three pieces):
Flashbacks. All strings unite on the note D in the pickup pattern of rhythmic motive IV, and the texture then steps away to chord 6–33 [023579] as <1705A3>. We note, once again, the C# and Eb extremities and the appropriate C#–G tritone of D minor at the bottom of the stack of (otherwise) perfect fourths. The sonority is familiar as chord ‘G’ from m.11 of the Präludium; and a “flashback” (DeVoto’s apt term) of the interjection idea that also occurred at that point in that piece now reappears in the Marsch. Earlier (p.507) it was pointed out that the flashback also constitutes a ‘compression’ of the large-scale bass motion of mm.110(perhaps 108)–126. It was further suggested (p.511, above) that the same 6–33 chord is structurally implied—though rhythmically displaced—at the Höhepunkt of the Marsch (m.126).

Flickers. The 6–33 chord flickers and creeps chromatically upward through two octaves (strings pizzicato, woodwinds slowly ‘double tonguing’). Delta-2, once again the harbinger of closure, appears in canon à3:

\[
\begin{array}{cccccccc}
\text{m.162} & \text{m.163} & \text{m.164} \\
\text{tr.} & 1 & 4 & 7 & 9 & A987 & 5 & 4 & 3 & 7 & 3 & 7 \\
\text{hn.} & 7 & A & 1 & 3 & 4321 & B & A & 9 & 1 & 9 & 1 \\
\text{tb.} & 2 & 5 & 8 & 0 & BA98 & 6 & 5 & 65 & 4 & 8 \\
\text{entries:} & <172>=[016] & \text{tag ends}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
\text{tag ends:} & 3 & 7 & \text{repartitioned as flickers (XXI, m.165):} \\
& 9 & 1 & <439> \text{ and } <817> \\
& 4 & 8 & [016] \text{ [016]}
\end{array}
\]

The entry-point pcs of the delta-2 canon, <172>, project a [016] trichord; the tritone component of the projected 016 is, once again, <C#–G>. The canons lag out to ‘tag-end thirds’: <37>, <91> and <48>. The tag ends are then
repartitioned (effectively, they are stacked as a verticality and then horizontalized) to become the "flickering" idea XXXI on clarinet, Eb-clarinet, and piccolo in m.165.

**Ticks.** The creeping 6–33 chord adjusts its direction in the middle of m.163 in order to converge on D4 just after the middle of m.164. (Recall the first innocent drop onto D4 in the flute back in m.134.) Once the D4 arrives it continues to tick away through m.170 in strings (with small tam tam), harp, and celesta. After the flickerings of XXXI dissipate over the ticking D, a very expressive statement of idea XII is laid out on muted trombone (m.166): <31A95B60548>. The reader will note that the trombone figure starts with Eb–C#, again the notes that circumnavigate D. Indeed, with the D ticking away in the background one might consider that part of the expressive impact of the trombone solo can be understood by considering it as a series of scale degrees about D: b2–#7–b6–5–3–6–#3–7–3–2–#4.

In terms of its pitch-class set content, idea XII is best segmented here as follows: <31A9>, <95B6>, and <0548>. The first two (overlapping) segments instance SC 4–15 [0146], the third is 4–19 [0148]. A ‘minor triad’ <058> subset of the final 4–19 is the probable link to the subsequent flute trichord (m.167–168, <703>; i.e., T7 of <058>). The horns (m.168–169) repeat the same sonority as the first trichord in a pair that recollect (at pitch) the accompanying chords from the beginning of the Episode (m.39): <703> to <806>. The leading idea (XV-1) of the Episode is also recalled by solo violin at this point (m.168): <68629>. The Episode idea instances SC 4–29 [0137]; its Z-related pair, 4–15 [0146], characterized the beginning of the preceding trombone solo statement of idea XII.

In general, XII is characterized by its uniform eighth note motion and its distinctive contour. That contour is entirely apparent in a brief sketch entry on page 9 of Berg 13/ii (line 5; the page has the heading “diverses”),
even though there are no pitches. Idea XII occurs four times in the Marsch, always as a solo line. **Figure 7.12** summarizes these occurrences:

**Figure 7.12: occurrences of idea XII; contour assessment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>m.</th>
<th>instr.</th>
<th>XII as pc string</th>
<th>contour [0 = lowest note]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>m.29</td>
<td>va</td>
<td>7 4 1 0 8 2 9 3 8 5 A</td>
<td>&lt;175A9630284&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m.40</td>
<td>vc</td>
<td>5 3 B 0 6 2 9 3 7 2 7</td>
<td>&lt;16487530252&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m.43</td>
<td>db</td>
<td>0 8 5 2 A 6 B 5 9 4 3</td>
<td>&lt;386A9720154&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m.166</td>
<td>tb</td>
<td>3 1 A 9 5 B 6 0 5 4 8</td>
<td>&lt;175A9630284&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In terms of pc-set contents idea XII has a chameleon-like character. The sets vary with the surrounding context. This is particularly true of the two statements in the Episode (m.40 and m.43; the details are available in Ex.7.17, pp.425–426). The contour column at the right of Fig.7.12 simply assigns the pitches of each statement of XII an integer from lowest pitch to highest pitch starting with 0. It is easily seen that the Episode statements are anomalous with respect to their contour profiles, but that the original exposition of XII and its recapitulation in this Coda have identical contours. Despite this identity the pc contents of the first and last statements differ considerably in detail: the segmentation of XII in m.166 (described on p.526, above) results in SCs 4–15, (overlapping) 4–15, and 4–19; the same segmentation applied to the original XII in m.29 yields SCs 4–18, 4–15, and 4–23 (Ex.7.11, p.406 supplies the details). Only the middle 4–15 SC matches and the pitch content of the two statements is quite varied—yet, in terms of contour, the trombone solo at m.166 recapitulates exactly the profile of the original solo viola XII at m.29.

The solo violin fragment of the Episode theme (m.168) is continued by English horn (quite high!) <454> in m.169. Based on the original Episode theme (m.39) the next note 'due' would drop a tritone, from E to Bb. This
does not happen. Instead, as the D4 continues to tick away, we find a 
fragmented and 'neutralized' variant of opening motive II. Solo double bass 
begin the motive from G2, but rises a 'minor' rather than a 'major seventh', 
to produce G2–F3. Bassoon and timpani share the next warbling tone: 
pitches Db–Eb. Again we note the placement about D, but the dyad also recalls 
the Wozzeck-quotation passage (m.79ff) and Berg's "Paukenwirbel" sketch 
(13/ii, p.22, described above on p.478). A single pizzicato Cb3 for cello 
(enhanced a stroke of triangle) complete the motive. We say motive II is 
'neutralized' here because it has been smoothed out into a wt1 pentachord (of 
course SC 5–33): <75 13– B>.

"Schluß"—Final fanfare, mm.171–174 (hammer blow #3)

At the edge of the wood, they fix their bayonets ...; the horns enforce them, 
the drums roll deepest bass, and forward they stumble, as best they can, with 
shrill cries; nightmarishly, for clods of earth cling to their heavy boots and 
fetter them. ... But the wood emits new swarms, who fling themselves 
down, who spring up, who, shrieking or silent, blunder forward over the 
fallen. 

The final fanfare is an extraordinary piece of orchestral writing.
Stravinsky felt that "the last bar in the trumpets [was] one of the finest things 
Berg ever did (1959, 73)." There is a single sketch for this closing passage in 
Berg 13/ii (p.5), though in Chapter 3 (p.141) I discuss the anomalous Berlin 
"sketch" (D-Bspk, N.mus.ms. 70) which, for the most part—without being an 
exact copy—appears simply to transfer the contents of the 13/ii sketch to a 
different type of paper. (In places, the Berlin "copy" functions as a second, 
clarifying source for the passage.) The 13/ii sketch is transcribed in Example 
7.46 (see next page):
Example 7.46: Transcription of Berg 13/ii, p.5; sketch for "Schluß"

Notes:

1. may refer to earlier passage; e.g., mm.141-142
2. "d[i]ito" [?]; Berlin page writes out: "Harfe sehr tief"
3. Berlin writes out: "gedämpft Tuba" 4. sharp sign; overwritten K[?]
5. "Akkorde" squiggles (both sources) 6. text smudged, overwritten:
"Schluß Verläuft Schluß": middle word could be "Harfe" (overwritten);
word below it faded; "Tr[?]" written over faded notation and/or word
The top system of Example 7.46 shows a descending figure that perhaps refers to an earlier passage; e.g., mm.141–142. The timpani E–F# eighth notes may intend the Db–Eb dyad in m.170, or perhaps the general ticking of triplet eighth notes on D that characterizes m.165ff in the score. The reference to "muted tuba" ["ged. Tb"] in "walking eighths" ["gehende 8tel"] at the end of sketch line 4 (the Berlin document writes out "gedämpft Tuba") probably reflects the muted trombone solo (idea XII) in m.166–167 of the score. The 'chordal squiggles' (lines 8–9) are found in both documents: they perhaps refer back to the chordal flux at m.136ff. The end of the 13/ii sketch is extremely messy; smudged and overwritten. My deciphering of the text written across the staves in lines 8–10 must be considered provisional. The word "Verläuft" makes sense given the scattered passagework in the final fanfare; though "Harfe" may overwrite it. Similarly, the suggested "Tr" (or "tr") below it is written over a faded (or erased) earlier musical and/or verbal notation. Transcription of the bottom line of text is also somewhat conjectural ("Alle Ruhe ergeb[?]"): but the 'surrender of peace', the yielding to the catastrophe of war, is surely the feeling so boldly captured in the final measures of the score.

The Berlin document has several additional annotations written above and to the left of the (somewhat varied, more schematic [post facto?]) musical sketch: "Plötzlich ganz Ein[?] (Mitteltheil)"; "Schließlich alles überstürzend (und I I Theil)"; and, nearer to the sketch at the right, "immer Hoher zum Schluß". The Berlin source is also more schematic in its annotation of the final trumpet buildup: Berg stacks roman numerals I–IV, top to bottom: I leads into the final stroke with an eighth-note triplet; II approaches with two eighths, III with a single eighth, and IV just shows the stroke. In both sources the top note at the end was expected to be C# (rather than the swarming Bb of the score); the final bottom note is, however, low E in both sources.
Example 7.47: Schluß, mm.171–174; reduction and analytical notes

cf. delta-1 at m.45–46 and m.149ff.
Example 7.47 (on the previous page) presents the final fanfare in annotated reduced score. (The top staff of the Example will be explained after we examine the contents of the passage.) In m.171, tuba, trombone, and bassoon seize control of the texture with a fff statement of interjection idea XVIII in the form, and at the pitch level, of its original entry in m.56. The Example shows the interlocking of Opus-6-generative 016 and 014 trichords that are embedded in XVIII and its continuation. (The parallel thirds <A2> <B3> of m.171, beat 4 would partition overlapping 014s as follows: <AB3> and <B23>. Incidentally, the total pc contents of idea XVIII produce SC 7–21 [0124589]; this same abstract septachord was the big verticality in the Codetta, m.76ff; in a configuration of stacked thirds, specifically as <2591480>, it also accounted for the larger referential sonority of Reigen, e.g. m.42.)

At the end of m.172, the trumpets enter on G4 with a compression of the pickup variant of motive I: cf. motive XIII, and also motive VIII. (The pitches of VIII are perhaps actually embedded within the proceedings: Eb4 [m.174, b.3], G4 [trumpets], F#4 [m.174, b.3, last sixteenth]; [C and Db] are then part of the horn figure in m.173.) The trumpets next employ the rhythm of motive IV as a pickup into the runs of m.173ff. Below the trumpets, the trombones present four dyads that result in a variety of vertical trichords ([024], [015], [037], [048]).

On the lower system of the Example, we see that the trumpet runs recall creeping idea XXX (cf. m.122 and m.130ff): the runs begins with ic1 from A3 to Db4; then move in whole-tones (ic2) shifting from wt1 to wt0 at the end of m.173. The horn recalls flickering tag idea XXXI, a chaining of two 016 trichords as <106>+<5A4>. Once the first trumpet (doubled by xylophone) reaches the high Bb in m.174, the others swarm towards it from below. The attack approach is deployed in two ranks, though every trumpet entry grabs an element from each rank (see the slurs in Ex.7.47, m.174): beginning from
the sustained horn-trumpet dyad <Eb5–F5> in m.173 (beat 4), the upper rank moves chromatically from G5 up to Bb5; the lower rank reaches down to A4 and (avoiding the octave-duplicating Bb4) proceeds chromatically from B4 up to Eb5. The final tritone connecting E5 and Bb5—which might be construed as 'due'—occurs only with the final plummet to bass note E2 (and E1).

In the midst of this voice-leading swarm, the lines coalesce (though only for an instant) to register two vertical tetrachordal sonorities (in m.174, at the beginning of beats 1 and 2). Both instance SC 4–22 [0247]: as <1358> and <357A>. Remarkably, the second 4–22 displays the pcs of the opening referential sonority of the Präludium (timpani chord ‘P’, though not, of course, in its original chordal disposition or register).

The top line of Example 7.47 compares the final fanfare with delta-1 as it occurred at m.45–46 (trombone and harp) and in the climactic fanfare marziale of m.149ff (trumpets, horns, and trombones). In that previous fanfare, the general direction of activity was downward. And it was revealed in Ex.7.45 (p.521; see the asterisks [*]) that the main tones of that 'third run at idea XXIII-1' matched delta-1 (in the form of m.45–46) both in pitch contents and general contour. Following the arrival of the mighty tritone drop, Bb2–E2 (in m.152; also the bottom of the original delta-1 figure in m.46), the fanfare marziale passage pushed on with wild arpeggiations (m.152–153), and forced its way to the powerful cadential arrival in m.155 (beginning of the Coda). Here, in the final fanfare, the general direction of activity is upward. Yet, as the alignment of the top staff with the excerpt shows, many of the emphasized tones in the final fanfare also match those of delta-1. Specifically, we note that the initial Bb1 of XVIII, the F#3 (crushed by G) at the top of its triplet (marking the spot where 016s yield to 014s), and the D4 at the beginning of the rhythmic snap (m.171, b.4) are the pcs of the initial descending 048 trichord of delta-1 (as <A62>).
The parenthetic annotation on the top staff in m.172 shows that a 014 (as <C#4 to C4–E4>) might be extracted from the end of the continuation of XVIII (m.172, last two sixteenths of beat 2). But the fanfare is in too much of a rush to dwell on such a fleeting correspondence; and C#–E–C is, in any case, not the correct pitch level for the '014-tag' in the middle of delta-1. We should first pass through Db to C, and the 014 tag should be C–Eb–B. The required Db appears as the initial note of horn idea XXXI at the beginning of m.173. It also marks the beginning of the trumpets' switch from ascending ic1 to ic2 segments on the third beat of m.173. Trumpet 1 next switches from ascending wt1 (beginning on Db4) to wt0 (beginning on C5) on the fourth beat. Together these significant moments of change in surface design provide us with the next pcs of our delta-1 match.

The 014-tag is due next, as <03B>; and the notes are contained in trumpet 4 (beginning at m.173, beat 4): C5 (passing through D5) to Eb5, then B4 (m.174, b.2, second sixteenth). As our argument goes, this last note (B4) is certainly the least-convincingly related to delta-1, since, in terms of the sound of the texture as a whole, it is merely part of the lower-rank ascent begun by trumpet 2 from A4 on the last sixteenth of m.174, b.1; at the same time, the argument gets some support from the fact that the notes required for the delta-1 derivation, C5–Eb5–B4, are all contained in one part (trumpet 4). Finally, the presence of last two notes of delta-1—the tritone drop Bb–E—could not possibly be more emphatic in m.174. This is the final plummet into the abyss: from swarming Bb5 (and Bb6) to E2 (and E1) on the last sixty-fourth note of the measure—the final blow of the hammer.
A Coda of Conclusions

The final tritone drop at the end of m.174 of the Marsch brings our Opus 6 journey to an end. The transformative process that results in Berg's musical conclusion must be the model for our own. Accordingly, this Coda of Conclusions is more Schluß than summary, as much reflection as recapitulation.

Our study of the Marsch is unavoidably unwieldy due to the confluence of complexities both documentary and analytical. Indeed, the undertaking is only rendered possible in the first place because it can build upon the impressive thematic analysis of DeVoto (1980, and particularly 1984). (Though the reader might have welcomed my burying in footnotes many of the analytical digressions above, there are no "Notes to this Chapter" precisely because—apart from DeVoto's important contributions, and a few observational gems in Jarman 1979, Archibald 1989, and Adorno [1968] 1991—the literature on the Marsch is pretty parsimonious.) The transformational procedures in the work are daunting, but our establishment of the "delta pedigree" of the thematic complex about idea XXIII that dominates the Second Half suggests a large-scale cyclic-thematic shift.

Specifically, there is a shift from alpha-beta derivations in the First Half to delta derivations in the Second Half. Though such a distinction is dangerously broad, it is—by way of Schluß to our study of the Marsch—worth summarizing here. The initial ideas of the First Half, motives I and II, employ the 014 and 016 generative trichords found throughout Opus 6. These cells are also the basis of cyclic themes alpha and beta. The initial 'Melodie' of the Marsch shows thematic succession V–delta-2–VI (m.5). Idea V, as a reworking of the Präludium interjection theme is alpha-based (it links two 014s). Delta-2—here with its 'normal' upward 036 trichordial incipit—first surfaced in Reigen, where it was a harbinger of closure (e.g., m.105). Idea VI,
though unique to the *Marsch*, features whole-tone tetrachord 4–25 (0268) but its first seven pcs also effect the same set-class (7–28) as delta-2.

Rhythmic motives I, III, and IV also function throughout the piece as incipits to various transformed themes (see Fig.7.5, p.404). As the Exposition unfolds, motives I and II are melded together in the extraordinary theme VIII (m.11); and the alpha-pedigree of I is made explicit in the Counter-Exposition (at m.20). The Transition (m.25) employs strongly contrasting (and not altogether unproblematic) chordal (X), cadential (XI), and melodic (XII) ideas and an Episode (m.39) quietly moves even further afield before everything in the first quarter of the piece is terminated by a significant combination of *delta-2* and *delta-1* at m.44–46. Both of these deltas are modified so that their normal 036 trichordal incipit is changed to 048. This modified later characterizes the leading thematic idea of the Second Half.

The Middle Section (m.46ff)—in at least some respects typical—develops modified and contrasting ideas: broadly speaking the 014/alpha group develops into IX and XIX, the 016/(beta) group uses II to develop into XVI and XVII. Interjection idea XVIII (m.56), though it seems to come out of nowhere, combines 016 and 014, thus reversing the opening sequence of generative trichords: the idea later returns to initiate the final fanfare of the piece. Two relatively self-sufficient passages then close out the Middle Section: (1) the striking *grazioso*, XX, its basic idea a combination of alpha-group derivatives IX and XIX and 016/beta-group motive II; and (2) the ‘big tune’, XXI, its string of pcs an obscure T7 transform of the extension of accompaniment motive III from the beginning of the work, but a derivation that is explicitly found in the sketches (Ex.7.27, p.454). The texture is then subject to a takeover bid by idea XIII (m.71ff). XIII is originally (m.31), and by careful measured process (m.62, vc; m.66, hn), a transformation of VIII, but it is here truncated to the contrasting ‘whole-tone trichord’ 026. The 026
suggests a 'structural-framing' relation back to the last segment of the opening 'Melodie' idea VI, which features whole-tone tetrachord 4–25 [0268] (026 is its only trichordal subset, four-times embedded). The takeover then culminates in a Codetta (m.76) of vertical septachords (notably 7–21) and returning 014 and 016 combinations (in the outer voices of the 7–21 as well as in the central brass flourish), before a chordal dénouement (XXII) ushers in the renowned 'Wozzeck-quotation' passage (mm.79–83), which terminates with a snappish delta-2. The quotation's dyads, Eb–Db and A–G—we can now explicitly state—also result in SC 4–25 [0268] and all of idea VI immediately follows in the layered ostinato of mm.84–91. In this way, delta-2, and the 0268 component are the elements of the First Half that set up the move to the Second Half.

These observations on the alpha-beta thematic-transformational preferences of the First Half of the Marsch are brought together here in order to emphasize their distinction from the more-recently-described delta-based transformations that characterized the Second Half. There, the 'three runs' (summarized in Ex.7.36, p.489) at idea XXIII move progressively closer to its realization as a transformation of delta. In the 'first run' (Ex.7.40, p.501) only the 'modified' 048 incipit (from delta-1, m.45–46, with same pcs <A72>) and the 0268 end-tetrachord of VI are evident in leading idea XXIII-1. In the 'second run' (Ex.7.41, p.504) XXIII-1 is in augmentation in the bass and the upwardly-contoured XXIII-2 leads. Following the Höhepunkt (m.126), 'normal' delta-2 (with 036 incipit) returns as a 'portent of closure', but it is in the formal position that was just occupied by XXIII-2 (with incipit 048 in m.107; both are shown in Ex.7.36, p.489): the delta-2–XXIII-2 connection is becoming explicit. Finally, as was demonstrated above (in Ex.7.45, p.521) in the 'third run', the fanfare marziale (m.149), the transformational relation between XXIII-1 and delta-1 becomes quite evident. And, in the closing
fanfare (m.171; Schluß, Ex.7.47, p.531) the surface 016 and 014 (beta-alpha) generators that instigate interjection idea XVIII (in its new terminating role) are joined by the the deeper-level revelation of a composed-out delta-1: the Schlüssel to this Schluß.

At this point, some recapitulation is in order. As was stated at the outset, this is the first full-length documentary and analytical study of Opus 6. The study has developed an understanding of the ways in which these three pieces embody expressive and compelling solutions to the central and ongoing challenge of twentieth-century musical syntax: the construction of large-scale formal designs outside the traditional tonal idiom. Berg, as Stravinsky observed, is perhaps “the most gifted constructor in form of the composers of this century (1959, 71).” For the rest of us, composers–performers–musical scholars, this giftedness is both inspiring and slightly terrifying.

The core of this study has been the documentary and analytical investigations of the individual pieces. In our study of the Präludium (Chapter 4), it was shown that the piece posits a non-triadic referential sonority (‘gapped fourth chord’ <7[0]5BA3>, SC 5–23 [02357]; otherwise, with pc0, diatonic hexachord 6–32). Analysis in the present study reveals, and sketch sources corroborate, that the Introduction and Main Theme of the work is based on an underlying chaconne-like progression of several chords. In showing how the surface of the piece interacts with this underlying progression, our analysis (partially supplemented by Archibald 1966, Jameux 1975, DeVoto 1980, Micznik 1986, and Taylor 1989) reveals that much of the structural voice-leading and motivic activity of the work constitutes a ‘composing between the tones’ of the referential sonority.
Analytical work on *Reigen* was greatly assisted by the seminal study by Bruce Archibald (1968). In our Chapter 5, the rubrics ‘blocks, chains, and cycles’ were used to generalize analytical observations. We examined orchestral blocks of ‘polyphonic planes’ and ‘planing block-chordal progressions’, successions of ‘formal blocks’ with traditional functions, and ‘harmonic blocks’ as recurrent referential sonorities. We considered the role played by the Schenkerian techniques of ‘linkage’ and ‘structural framing’ in the chaining together of orchestral blocks and in the construction and deconstruction of themes. We discussed the importance of cyclic motives alpha-beta-gamma and delta in the piece and the function of progression by interval-cycle segments (as developed by Perle 1977a and 1977b). At the beginning and end of the Chapter (following Falck 1985) we revealed Berg’s adaptation of Wilhelm Fliess’s numerological fetishes (23’s and 28’s) and his use of Arthur Schnitzler’s notorious play *Reigen* as the underlying formal and programmatic template for his composition.

In general, on the documentary side, one must reiterate the challenge of Berg sketch studies. In the first place, the sketches are generally so messy, so often close to illegible that I originally considered declaring them unintelligible. Now—the experience of several years and the efforts of several scholars later—a compilation of working transcriptions for a good number of Berg’s sketches has become a practical, if not always satisfyingly complete, possibility. The procedures employed in this study in order to render these documents usable were outlined in the Introduction (Chapter 1, pp.23–24). Nonetheless, certain passages seem destined to remain problematic, some of Berg’s textual annotations particularly so. Such mechanical challenges of transcription aside, my principal interest in the sketches lies in their value as a window into the nature of musical intuition in general, a window into Berg’s compositional processes in particular.
Berg's sketches, if one can break the code, give musicians an opportunity to witness musical intuition at work in its most direct yet amorphous guise. Stravinsky felt that Berg's forms, "however complex, however 'mathematical'," were "always 'free' thematic forms born of 'pure feeling' and 'expression' (1959, 72)." Berg's sketches are testimony to this 'purity'—one might better say 'rawness'—of 'expression'. Adorno recounts that Berg explicitly urged him, as a composition student, to employ this method of sketching so as "to prevent my getting too involved in details at the expense of overall coherence ... he advised me to write out just one or two voices over long stretches, possibly even without specific notes, just rhythms or contour, neumatic sketching, as it were (1991, 33)." Berg's sketches strive for the 'musical idea' in both its smallest and its broadest generality: motivic fragments, textural combinations, unpitched contours, rhythmic gestures. It is indeed humbling to see that a composer whose finished scores appear so obsessively exact seemed frequently to have had only the vaguest notion of where he was going in the initial stages of composition, particularly with respect to precision of pitch. Yet the present study has shown that many of these sketches nonetheless encapsulate essential aspects of the musical problems with which they wrestle.

The "March through the Documents" in Chapter 3 reveals much about the complexity of the documentary issues surrounding Berg's early work. We survey of the autograph score and fair copy for Opus 6 (both now at the Pierpont Morgan Library in New York) and review of the layout of the Particell (A-Wn F 21 Berg 12). Quite beyond these concerns lies our detailed discussion of sketchbook reconstruction—which proposes an amalgamation of sources A-Wn Berg 65 and A-Wst MH 14.263/c and comments on the relation between the Opus 6 and Wozzeck halves of A-Wn Berg 13/ii. Such an undertaking involves bibliographical problems that have a venerable
musicological tradition (most notably in Beethoven sketch studies), but which have (so far) seldom been seen through to the end in studies of twentieth-century composers.

Berg's Particell is a particularly valuable document. The Particell is not only crucial as an editorial resource, it also provides insight into a number of relatively late compositional changes, and it regularly documents Berg's conceptualization of the textural layout and thematic content. As an aid to analytical research, the Particell often sheds light on the balance and interaction of parts and on the function of different strata in complex orchestral circumstances: the document thus often helps (literally) to underscore the fundamental musical ideas in a passage. Though the later performance and publication history of Opus 6 has not been the principal focus of this study, the overview in Chapter 6 opens up several areas of inquiry that would warrant broader study: aspects of orchestral instrumentation and performance practice, documentation of reception history and editorial process.

On the analytical front, this study has employed and extended a mixture of contemporary approaches and tools; in particular—structural voice-leading, pitch-class set theory, and the analysis of formal function. My intentions for the use of these tools were discussed at some length in the Introduction (Chapter 1, pp.24-42). The reader will by now have developed some sense of their practical value—as well as their theoretical limitations. Our summary here is limited to a review of Berg's use of pitch-class sets.

One must distinguish the manipulation of pitch-class sets as motivic entities from their use as collectional resources. Vertical combinations (chords simultaneous or proximately so) may function locally as associated harmonies that help guide the ear through the organization of a phrase or
small section, or they may have more global significance as recurrent referential sonorities in the large-scale formal design.

Though trichordal entities might be trivially identified all over the place, it is evident that trichords 014 and 016 have a "generative" status for much of Opus 6: 014, for example, is the header for both Main and Subordinate Themes in the Präludium, for the Main Theme in Reigen, and for motive I in the Marsch; 016, by way of illustration, breaks the pure fourths of the Präludium, chains together the approach to the climax in Reigen, and provides the framework for important motive II in the Marsch.

Other motivic trichords have more local significance: 013, for example, appears as an explicit manipulation of, or alternative to, the generative 014: consider, for example, the 013 incipits to Marsch ideas IX-1, IX-2, XIV, and XX. To a far less-prevalent extent, 015 can function as an expansion of 014 or as a compression of 016. Trichord 012 is an aggressive snap or expressive slither: consider Marsch ideas XVI, XVII, XXIV-1, XXVII; or the chromatic slides in delta-1, delta-2, and VI, and in the crucial Marsch-Präludium flashback. The 026 trichord has a prominent 'contrasting role'; for example, as the incipit of the Subordinate Theme in Reigen (e.g., m.36, m.56) and as the head of takeover idea XIII in the Marsch (e.g., m.76). As we have just shown, the 'diminished' (036) and (alternatively) the 'augmented' (048) trichord have salient motivic roles in the transformational process associated with the incipits of cyclic idea delta in the Marsch.

Several tetrachords have recurrent motivic or referential status, notably that favourite of atonal tetrachords 4–19 [0148]. In the Präludium, the 'gapped fourth-chord tetrachord' 4–22 [0247] plays an important role from the outset where it is first heard on timpani. Cyclic motive beta consists of two tetrachordal strands (though we have shown how they are constructed from combinations of 014s and 016s): normally, 4–29 [0137] over 4–13 [0136].
Occasionally, Berg substitutes the Z-related all-interval tetrachordal partner for 4–29: 4–15 [0146]. Other significantly recurrent tetrachordal sonorities include the ‘seventh-chord’ types—4–19 [0148] (as noted above), 4–20 [0158], 4–26 [0358], 4–27 [0258], and 4–28 [0369]; ‘quartal’ 4–23 [0257] (though not as ubiquitous as its ‘gapped’ counterpart, 4–22); and the ‘whole-tone’ types—4–21 [0246], 4–24 [0248], and (one of Berg’s personal favourites) 4–25 [0268].

Though sonorities of five, six, seven, or more notes abound in the work, relatively few of these recur often enough, or maintain a sufficiently characteristic disposition, to acquire referential status. The statement of the aggregate as an ic5 verticality at the climax of Reigen (m.66) and the eleven-pc chord at its conclusion are striking, but exceptional, referents. Other collections with referential status include: 5–23 [02357], the ‘gapped fourth chord’ of the Präludium; 5–17 [01348] and 5–21 [01458] as parts of the referential sonority in Reigen; and 5–37 [03458], the Z-related partner of 5–17, which is the Marsch-Präludium flashback idea.

Amongst the hexachords, diatonic 6–32 [024579] and whole-tone 6–35 [02468A] have a status as ‘background’ resources from which smaller motivic and referential materials are extracted. It was suggested that 6–20 [014589], as a potential combination of 014s or 048s, plays a similar role at the beginning of the Marsch. The progression from 6–22 [012468] to 6–21 [023468] which was shown to underlie the beginning and end of the chordal flux, Marsch m.136 and m.142 is of a different perceptual order entirely. 6–22 is, incidentally, also the instanced by the total content of Second-Half cadential-interjection idea XXV (m.94). That famous atonal hexachordal complement-pair, 6–19[013478]/6–44[012569] (the latter is Schoenberg’s so-called “signature hexachord”), is not broadly significant in Opus 6, though 6–19 is one aspect of the referential sonority for Reigen. Two other hexachords merit special mention because they sound so lovely: Präludium chords ‘D’ (the first Klangfarbenakkord at
m.9; 6–47 [012479]) and 'G' (m.11, 6–33 [023579])—the latter, as <1705A3>, recurs momentously at the flashback point in the Marsch (and, it was suggested, is also behind the Höhepunkt). Significantly, its upper portion contains the referential sonority of the Präludium.

Finally, amongst the septachords: the larger referential sonority of Reigen is 7–21 [0124589] (heard in a particularly beautiful, Schreker-like celesta arpeggiation in m.42, essentially as stacked thirds <2591480>)—the total pc content of Marsch fanfare interjection idea XVIII is also 7–21, but I doubt so distant a correspondence is tellingly audible. Similarly, and perhaps more remarkably, the total content of beta's two tetrachords yields 7–28 [0135679]; as was briefly noted earlier, SC 7–28 is also instanced by the total pc content of delta-2 and by the the first seven notes of idea VI, which immediately follows.

Berg's Opus 6 marks his moment of real artistic and personal independence from Schoenberg. The story of its composition (related in Chapter 2) begins and ends with the Schoenberg-Berg relationship from 1912–1915 and includes Berg's various plans to impress his teacher with a purely orchestral work to follow the brilliant, though disastrously-premiered, Altenberglieder. Detailed examination of Berg's activities in this period helps refine the Entstehungsgeschichte of Opus 6. It allows us to explain the role of the Passacaglia-Fragment and the Symphonie-Fragment in that process. The story shows that Berg's developing independence was, in part, forced upon him by a falling-out with his teacher. In recovering from that situation, Berg found new inner strength. And typically—though under the circumstances rather ironically—it was a suggestion from Schoenberg that he compose 'character pieces rich in thematic development', that prompted Berg to hit upon what I have called his 'programmatic solution'. Henceforth, he made himself, his personal situation, and his literary interests the underlying
programme of his compositions: in Opus 6, this became the Marsch eines Asthmatikers and the Schnitzler-and-Fliess-related Reigen.

Several aspects of Opus 6 warrant circumspection. As Boulez noted, the Marsch, in particular is "indulgent." The textural density is sometimes so overwhelming that it is easy to conclude that the pieces are seriously overwritten. The places most likely to be given citations for this offense are the build-ups to m.107 and m.126 of the Marsch, yet from a form-functional perspective it seems clear enough what these locations intend—clarity of the individual orchestral strands not being the priority. Curiously, the passage that most sticks out in my mind is from the Präludium—in the continuation of the Subordinate Theme, mm.27-36, the imitative looseness and textural burgeoning feels like overkill. The excessiveness in textural build-up so early in the Exposition of the Marsch is similarly bothersome. Yet in both of these cases, upcoming events or particular elements in the orchestral mix provide adequate compensation—e.g., the splendid working of the climax itself in m.36 of the Präludium, and the excellently constructed theme VIII in the Marsch Exposition.

Stravinsky once commented that Berg "transcends even his most overt modelling (1959, 71)." In Opus 6, we have suggested that the Präludium is, in part, modelled on Schoenberg's op.16, no.3. However, an even broader reflection of Berg's indebtedness to his studies with Schoenberg in harmony, counterpoint, and form can be described. In the broadest sense, we might say that each of the Opus 6 pieces concentrates on 'transcending' one of these compositional subdisciplines. The Präludium is about harmony: about essaying a harmonic progression (very much in the manner prescribed in Schoenberg's Harmonielehre); the piece then transcends this model by establishing the initial sonority as referential, by placing its recurrences and modified recurrences at significant structural moments, and by connecting
these in a more sophisticated, structural variant of surface voice-leading that we have described (after the coinage of Laufer 1986) as ‘composing between the tones’. *Reigen*, its lush harmonies aside, is about *form*: it employs what we have variously described as blocks, chains, and cycles, all with a mind to numerological and programmatic subtexts, in order to generate a formal ‘Reigen’ (round-dance) which is uniquely its own. Finally, the *Marsch*, despite its harmonic and formal complexities, is about *counterpoint*: as the sketch evidence reveals, this counterpoint concerns combinations in both dimensions—‘vertical’ shufflings of thematic ideas in what I have called ‘multiple-counterpoint texture’, and ‘horizontal’ juxtapositions of unrestrainedly transmogrified material.

Overall, after lengthy documentary and analytical work, the Opus 6 pieces, despite—and sometimes because of—their excesses and occasional flaws, still strike me as a marvel of conception and execution. Stravinsky went further. As we noted at the beginning of our *Praeludium* analysis in Chapter 4, Stravinsky (1959, 72) declared Opus 6 “the perfect work ... the essential work, with *Wozzeck*, for the study of all of [Berg’s] music.” He felt that “Berg’s personality is mature in these pieces” and he even considered Opus 6 a “richer and freer expression of his talent than the twelve-note serial pieces” (though I cannot entirely agree with this last sentiment). Stravinsky concludes: “When one considers their early date—1914, Berg was twenty-nine—they are something of a miracle. I wonder how many musicians have discovered them even now ... ”

The final word we leave to Berg (as quoted in Reich 1963, 67 [1965, 72]). Given the complexities of the pieces, it is perhaps a warning for composer, author, and reader alike: “*Das haben Sie noch nicht ganz ausgehört!*”

“You haven’t quite heard that out yet!”
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