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The aim of this dissertation is to apply a narrative analytical lens to selected cyclic British chamber music compositions from the early part of the twentieth century: Ralph Vaughan Williams’ Piano Quintet in C Minor (1903) and Phantasy Quintet (1912); Rebecca Clarke’s Piano Trio (1921); and Frank Bridge’s String Quartet No. 3 (1927). This narrative reading will examine both micro- and macroscopic elements of the selected works, including large-scale formal structures, thematic recurrence and transformation, motivic manipulation, and pitch-class conflict.

Chapter One contextualizes these works with respect to the musical, educational, and compositional culture of the English Musical Renaissance. Chapter Two provides an overview of the history of musical narrative, its main practitioners, and its critics, as the point of departure for my methodology. The ensuing chapters proceed chronologically, from a mostly tonal compositional language associated with traditional formal constraints to one that is mostly atonal and formally less predictable.

Chapter Three compares two early works of Vaughan Williams in terms of their relative success in incorporating influences from both his German compositional lineage and his burgeoning interest in the national music of Britain. While the 1903 Piano Quintet attempts a stylistic synthesis, the two languages never coalesce in a satisfactory way, and the work avoids any convincing sense of closure. In 1912, the Phantasy Quintet more successfully merges the two influences, leading to a sense of both structural and narrative closure.
Chapter Four focuses on musical memory and its deployment in Rebecca Clarke’s 1921 Piano Trio. Written three years after World War I, Clarke’s composition features stark contrast between diatonic and symmetrical pitch collections. The interaction of alternative scales and pure modality, and the former’s corruption of the British folk idiom, serves to underscore the devastation incurred during the war.

In the final chapter, the post-tonal language of Frank Bridge’s String Quartet No. 3 and its gradual unfolding from a beginning state of formal convention to one of increasing ambiguity combine to suggest an anti-narrative. In particular, the pervasive thematic recurrence sets up an expectation of transformation but ultimately does not deliver.
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CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION AND HISTORICAL CONTEXT

Introduction

The aim of this dissertation is to use a narrative analytical lens in understanding selected cyclic British chamber music compositions from the early part of the twentieth century. The works to be considered are Ralph Vaughan Williams’s Piano Quintet in C Minor (1903) and Phantasy Quintet (1912), Rebecca Clarke’s Piano Trio (1921), and Frank Bridge’s String Quartet No. 3 (1927). I will form this narrative reading by examining both micro- and macroscopic elements of the selected works; these elements will include large-scale formal structures, thematic recurrence and transformation, motivic manipulation, and pitch-class conflict within specific movements and over the course of the multi-movement works as a whole. This approach will be enhanced by and infused with a synthetic approach to music-narrative analysis of instrumental music, influenced largely by the work of Michael L. Klein, Byron Almén, and Robert Hatten. I also consider these works in a historical context, especially their place in the lives of their composers.

It is beyond dispute that the music of the early twentieth century provides myriad difficulties for the analyst: it often explores a hazy pitch-structural landscape that crosses boundaries between tonality, extended tonality/intense chromaticism, free atonality, and serialism, often combining several of these features. As such, it is difficult to apply one sole analytical methodology to a specific composition. We also see a distortion of conventional forms at this time, or dissolution of them altogether. Additionally, English chamber music from this period poses unique challenges to the analyst for several reasons. Aside from the tonal and formal issues, the attempt to reestablish a “national music,” the primary goal of the English
Musical Renaissance from approximately 1860 to 1940, calls into question what exactly is English about this music, if anything. Continental influence, either from these composers’ travels or studies abroad, their teachers and pedagogical heritage, and/or the music they were exposed to in the concert halls, was manifest to varying degrees in their compositions. Determining what is uniquely “English” in this music (or not) will have a strong bearing on both the narrative and structural aspects of the analysis.

In light of these issues, it may appear foolhardy even to contemplate a narrative analysis in the absence of clear tonal and formal expectations. Nonetheless, I propose that a narrative approach, especially one that includes a range of analytical strategies and historical contexts, can help provide an appropriate path into this difficult and ambiguous music. Aside from the challenging musical language that works from this time present to the theorist, there are other motivations for selecting these specific compositions. This music is decidedly underrepresented in American concert halls and in the academic world, due to the lacuna of scholarship on these pieces and their composers. Additionally, the musical culture in England surrounding World War I is one of transition, particularly as these composers worked to create a distinctly British musical identity through the English Musical Renaissance. Whether or not their attempt was successful and how exactly it materialized in the music is still debated; but the inclusion of Anglican anthems, folk tunes, modality, and the renewal of interest in works by Purcell, Tallis, and Byrd were clearly concerns of many of the composers of this era. Imbuing a composition with “Englishness,” while being undeniably influenced by compositional traditions from the continent and the Great War, leaves a potentially fruitful trail of analytical paths to explore.

The historical context of World War I will be crucial in tracing the development of compositional trends relevant to the works under consideration. In the two Vaughan Williams
works that predate the War, we find a style that features unexpected harmonic shifts, but
typically within triadic, modal, and pentatonic contexts. The relative placidity of these two pieces
gives way to a more expressionist style in the works of Clarke and Bridge, which approach the
dense, chromatic language of the Second Viennese School. Motives that echo the battlefield, the
use of thicker, grittier textures, and a general shift away from the diatonic and into chromatic and
symmetrical pitch spaces all may be understood as part of a compositional response to the
horrific events of 1914-1918.

Drawing upon current scholarship in the field of musical narrative, I formulate an
analytical methodology for the chosen compositions in chapter 2. In particular, the work of
Michael Klein, Byron Almén, and Robert Hatten provides a point of departure. Klein’s
consideration of intertextuality, cultural/historical factors, and their role in the process of musical
transformation will aid in understanding the music of early twentieth-century England;
moreover, his and Nicholas Reyland’s co-edited collection Musical Narrative Since 1900 is to
date the only collected volume solely dedicated to a narrative analysis of music from this time
period. Almén’s adaptation of Northrop Frye’s narrative archetypes helps interpret music-
structural elements with respect to the binary oppositions of victory/defeat and
order/transgression that enable a narrative reading. Hatten’s extensive work on topics and tropes
also proves useful; while my work will not attempt any sort of exhaustive topical survey of
Englishness in these compositions, his work can aid in the semiotic interpretation of particular
musical themes and gestures. Monahan’s and Tarasti’s writings on action and agency, along with
Maus’ publications on music’s dramatic characteristics, will help to identify the narrative
impulses latent in these compositions. Additional scholarly work on British musical culture
during this period, including narrative nostalgia, will prove useful. Finally, each of these multi-
movement works exhibits properties of the “cyclic sonata,” an important aspect of the formal process.

Before launching directly into detailed analyses of each individual work, a contextual framework needs to be established: first, for the social, political, and musical culture in England at the turn of the twentieth century; and for the theoretical subfield of musical narrative and its main contributors. To that end, the dissertation will open by discussing the musical climate in England at the turn of the twentieth century, the English Musical Renaissance, the rise of chamber music in society, and a capsule biography of each of the composers studied here, their teachers, and how they were each affected by World War I. Chapter 2 will focus on the field of musical narrative. It will identify the main contributors to the sub-discipline and their methodologies, the relative advantages and disadvantages of certain narrative analyses, and how I attempt to circumvent the problems that invite criticism of musical narrative in my analytical approach. Following the two introductory chapters, there will be chapters dedicated to the compositions in chronological order: first, the Vaughan Williams’s Piano Quintet (1903) and Phantasy Quintet (1912) from the pre-War era; then Rebecca Clarke’s Piano Trio (1921); and finally Bridge’s String Quartet No. 3 (1927).

* * * * *

Nineteenth-Century Antecedents to the English Musical Renaissance

The word “renaissance” connotes an emergence from something that was formerly moribund. In contextualizing the emergence of the English Musical Renaissance in light of the musical culture in England from the mid-1800s to the turn of the twentieth century, it is clear that
the term may be a misnomer, as England was stirring with an active musical climate from the 1840s onward. This nationalist movement did not appear out of a vacuum: instead, it organically developed alongside urbanization, the rise of the middle class, European tensions leading into World War I, the firm establishment of concert culture, and the institution of high-ranking music conservatories.

England in the mid-nineteenth century was in fact bustling with musical entertainment. To grasp fully the importance of musical culture throughout the century and into the beginning of the twentieth century, one may trace the development of concert life in nineteenth-century England through two distinct paths: that of the public concerts and that of subscription concerts held in private homes.

The establishment of the Philharmonic Society in 1813 changed the landscape of concert life in London, bringing the orchestral and chamber works of the “great composers” to the public.\(^1\) Orchestral works were prioritized, with chamber music compositions scattered throughout the individual concert programs. With the completion of the Crystal Palace in 1851, there was a much larger stage from which to perform works from the canon. In addition to hosting Handel festivals, a bi-weekly orchestral concert series began in earnest in 1854 under the direction of August Manns and continued until 1901.\(^2\) In 1858, St. James Hall opened, establishing a “Pops” concert series on Mondays. The lower price for admission to these concerts made music more accessible to a larger group of people, but the concerts did not skimp on quality. Its inaugural concert, held in 1859, featured violinist Henryk Wieniawski and pianist Charles Hallé. Such renowned musicians as Joseph Joachim and Clara Schumann performed


several times annually. Cobbett’s *Cyclopedic Survey of Chamber Music* cites the Pops concerts as the “cradle of chamber music in this country.”\(^3\) There were no orchestral works performed on this series, only chamber works with an occasional solo work or vocal piece. The accessibility of these concerts and their noteworthy success led to the addition of Saturday concerts, which continued for forty-three years. There were various other public concert organizations as well, including the Beethoven Quartet Society.

With the increase of urbanization and public concert life, efforts were made to expand access to musical performances to the burgeoning middle- and poorer classes. To that end, the South Place Concerts, begun in 1887, could be attended for free with the option of a donation.\(^4\) Shortly after that, the 1895 commencement of Promenade Concerts (or “Proms”) at Queen’s Hall brought a wide variety of compositions to the general populace. Cobbett marvels in his *Survey* that audiences were able to appreciate, understand, or even follow the high caliber of music presented to them, while noting that the concerts were “more like a large gathering of friends than a formal concert.”\(^5\) Around this time there was an uptick in periodicals geared toward the amateur performer and enthusiast.\(^6\) The appreciation for the Pops concerts, in addition to the accessibility of the South Place Concerts, led to a de-emphasis on orchestral performances in England. For musicologist Peter Evans, the recorded existence of over seventy chamber ensembles at the turn of the century suggests that orchestral performances had fallen out of favor with the general public; in turn this sets the stage for the resurgence of chamber music consumption and composition at the turn of the twentieth century.\(^7\) The trend of accessible

---

\(^5\) Ibid., 438.
chamber music continued into the 1900s with Sam Midgley’s Free Chamber Concert series, which forged a new path by featuring early performances of works by contemporary British composers.⁸

Along with the rise of public concerts of orchestral and chamber music, England was already home to a very enthusiastic choral and glee tradition, and choral music was the heart of English musicmaking. The preference was not for opera, but rather for oratorio.⁹ Handel’s oratorios were long a national tradition by the end of the 1800’s. Choral festivals were often the main outlet for composers, as they were one of the only places a new work could be heard by vast numbers of people. This could be a reason why Sir Hubert Parry and Sir Edward Elgar spent so much time writing cantatas and large, sacred choral works—they were a great way to gain exposure. The “singing mania” that arose among the public around mid-century was the result of both the rise in musical literacy—music and solmization were starting to be taught in schools around this time—and the low cost of printed choral music.¹⁰ Opera was a less successful medium for the English, with the exception of operettas by Gilbert and Sullivan. There were no real provincial opera houses, although there were decent audiences for the international operas performed at Covent Garden. The London Opera House, backed by Oscar Hammerstein I, had two short seasons before failing miserably.¹¹ Though British composers, including Holst and Vaughan Williams, composed operas, they were met with varying degrees of success.¹² British composers did not have much of a native operatic tradition to turn to, and grappled with the issue

---

of setting a “number” opera versus a quasi-Wagnerian through-composed music drama.\(^{13}\) Many of these works were performed and then faded away because they seemed merely to imitate the masterworks of Verdi and Wagner. Consequently, most English composers focused on oratorio or orchestral formats. Chamber music and opera were still continental strongholds. With the advent of what is now called the “English Musical Renaissance,” all of that began to change.

Despite the burgeoning interest in chamber music at public concerts, nowhere was its consumption more obvious than in the home. Around 1840, freelance musicians began to hold private chamber music concerts in their West End dwellings in an attempt to garner outside performing opportunities.\(^{14}\) Shortly thereafter, this idea became a fashionable, elitist event with the formation of the Musical Union by John Ella in 1830, appealing to the upper class and nobility. The performers, often foreigners, would play for about 200 people in private homes. Eventually the concerts moved to St. James’s Hall, but served as a subscriber event for 15 years. An aristocratic air dominated, and Cobbett noted that the music being performed “made no appeal to the masses.”\(^{15}\) The concerts were expensive, their locations inaccessible, and the dress formal. It was expected that the audience was highly musically literate and demonstrated a passion for music. Their acceptance was only granted if they were nominated by a preexisting member of the club and could prove their serious interest in music. This would have been important, considering such acclaimed musicians and composers as Hector Berlioz would attend concerts from time to time.\(^{16}\)

\(^{15}\) Cobbett, Vol. II, 185.
In addition to exclusive chamber concerts in lavish, private homes, musical performance was a frequent leisure activity of the upper and middle class in their own houses. As playing a musical instrument was a mark of a genteel upbringing, people would gather together and have quartet or quintet parties. Before 1870, it was not considered ladylike to play a stringed instrument, so women would join on the piano to form piano quintets with an all-male string quartet. After the social guidelines relaxed, it was not uncommon to have female violinists and violists (although they still did not play the cello).\(^{17}\) The music played by amateurs inside the home was almost exclusively continental as opposed to English, as that was what was available for public purchase. British compositions were generally reserved for public performances, households with links to a composer’s or professional musician’s social networks, or by professional musicians themselves.\(^{18}\)

For relaxed social gatherings, provincial towns formed smaller music societies where people would hear chamber works (primarily string quartets), but were encouraged to form their own quartets and perform.\(^{19}\) Occasionally, these music societies would spawn permanent trios or quartets who could rival some of the foreign quartets frequently brought in to perform for British society. It seems this sort of hybrid amateur-professional subculture led to the establishment of the People’s Concert Society in 1878. The Society’s goal was for enthusiastic amateurs to take their zeal for chamber music and perform for the lower-class citizens of the East End of London. The Society was still in existence when Cobbett published his *Survey* in 1930.\(^{20}\)

As mentioned above, most of the music performed by these organizations was from the canon, and much of it was Austro-German. Haydn, Mozart, Beethoven, and Schubert appealed to

\(^{18}\) Ibid., 322.
all members of society in England at the time, and this difficult repertoire demanded able
performers. Many of the players were professionals in established chamber groups, especially at
high-profile concerts like those at Wigmore Hall.21 The Pops concerts, on the other hand, often
featured professionals who were not used to playing together in addition to the foreign guest
superstars. Any amateur performer would have only played in free concerts to benefit the
members of the lower class.

There was an economic side to such concert activity as well. All of these concerts—there
would often be at least one concert a day for weeks at a time—generated money for whoever
presented them, and they were often funded by wealthy, zealous businessmen. As musical
training was customary at the time, the performers were typically amateur musicians as well.
Occasionally, a former musician-turned-businessman would present a concert as a side project.
Subscription-based concert series, attended almost exclusively by the elite and nobility, were
practically supported by the audience alone.22 These wealthy amateurs not only supported
musical performances but also composers. The Society of British Composers was established to
underwrite new compositions as well, but much of this fell to wealthy benefactors.23 The most
avid supporter of this enterprise was Walter Willson Cobbett, a lawyer, music (especially
chamber music) enthusiast, and amateur violinist. He funded many concerts, including premieres
by English composers, and invested much in publication of works and composition prizes. The
establishment of his Cobbett Competition fostered a resurgence in the field of British chamber
music, particularly the “phantasy” genre. Cobbett was a frequent contributor to the journal The

Music Student, opened the Free Library of Chamber Music, and published his comprehensive *Cyclopedic Survey of Chamber Music* in 1929.\(^{24}\)

Another factor that led to the rebirth of English composition was the establishment of several fine music conservatories. Prior to 1880, the primary place for music study was the Royal Academy of Music (RAM), opened in 1822. The Guildhall School for Music and Drama opened in 1880, with the Royal College of Music (RCM) following shortly thereafter. The RCM replaced the failed National Training School for Music after Arthur Sullivan’s ineffectual leadership.\(^{25}\) Once there were dedicated music conservatories of a high caliber in England, burgeoning composers and performers no longer felt as compelled to study in Germany. Some of the teachers at these institutions included Charles Villiers Stanford and Charles H.H. Parry, who taught and influenced the main contributors to the twentieth-century English Musical Renaissance.

This is not to say that universities did not encourage and support musical pursuits prior to 1880. Both Oxford and Cambridge had long-established musical clubs for performances of chamber music.\(^{26}\) Undergraduates were encouraged to form chamber groups and perform standard quartet repertoire. Occasionally, the two clubs would meet and perform for one another, and professional musicians would give master classes.\(^{27}\) Additionally, Cobbett’s competition was handed over to the RCM in 1923. After calling for compositions and commissioning them for 18 years, the competition and an endowment were passed to the college, and what was Cobbett’s competition became a composition award for college students only.\(^{28}\)

\(^{24}\) Ibid, 16.
\(^{27}\) Bashford, “Historiography and Invisible Musics,” 310-314.
With the establishment of several highly reputable institutions for musical education, native talent could study with native teachers. Add to this the vibrant orchestral and chamber music culture that had been brewing in England for approximately 50 years along with the twentieth-century creation of the Cobbett Competition, and we have the beginnings of a strong English musical identity. With it, two of the most recognizable names in Edwardian English music—Sir Edward Elgar and Gustav Holst—came to the fore, and would bring awareness to British compositions and influence the generation of composers addressed here. This study does not investigate compositions by Elgar and Holst. However, they deserve mention, because they were contemporaries of Vaughan Williams, Clarke, and Bridge, and their early success drew attention to a new school of composition in England at the end of the nineteenth century.

* * * * *

Musical Training on British Soil

With the rise of chamber music culture and education coupled with the emergence of two noteworthy British composers, Edward Elgar and Gustav Holst, all factors were in place for English chamber music to become less reliant on past compositions from mainland Europe. It happens that the political and social climate in England was also primed for a nationalist movement, leading George Grove to conceive of the mission of the “Musical Renaissance,” a term coined by Morton Latham at a lecture titled “The Musical Renaissance in England” at Stanford’s College, Trinity, in June 1888.29 Until the last quarter of the nineteenth century, Victorian England did not prioritize music or music education in secondary schools and

Anglican churches, and largely kept the classes separate for musical entertainment, as mentioned earlier. During this time, the work of Handel, an Anglicized German composer, was firmly entrenched in the musical traditions. In his book on Charles Villiers Stanford, Paul Rodmell writes,

Not only had Britain been wedded to Germany in musical terms since the time of Handel, but it had been linked politically too; the accession of George I in 1714 created strong links between Britain and Germany…emerging racial theories in the late nineteenth century also led to an emphasis on the ‘affinities’ of the English and German peoples and their difference from the ‘Latin’ people of France and Italy.  

Mid-century Victorians also gravitated toward Mendelssohn, an almost second coming of Handel in their eyes, and who closely aligned with their conservative ideals. His death in 1847 occurred just as Austro-German music began to undergo drastic changes in texture, tonal language, and form. Each major European country could claim some level of compositional success as a source of national pride, and it was suddenly noticeable that England had not produced any standout composers in quite some time.

All of this began to change as Arthur Sullivan showed promise and Prince Albert began to champion the arts with his Great Exhibition of 1851, leading to the establishment of the short-lived National Training School of Music. Governmental funding for the arts coupled with the loosening of Victorian ideals changed the way music was perceived by the British people. They were no longer satisfied with the perceived mediocrity of their own music and the stigma of performing in or attending concerts of only continental music.

George Grove’s musical legacy and influence on the English Musical Renaissance can be seen in two exceedingly important contributions: the publishing of his The Dictionary of Music and Musicians (first published in 1879), and his spearheading and eventual Directorship of the

---

RCM. As a railway engineer and architect, he was very involved in the Great Exhibition of 1851 and eventually became the secretary to the company that managed the Crystal Palace while maintaining involvement in several literary projects. As he observed the development of musical culture that resulted from the Crystal Palace concerts, Grove asserted that the progress of music in England since 1850 necessitated a scholarly companion. The first edition of the *Dictionary* was highly Anglocentric, certainly influenced by Grove’s abhorrence of the fact that two of the most civilized countries in Europe were involved in the Franco-Prussian War. As these two great countries had debased themselves, the distinguished, cultured people of England needed to have their own music to present to the world.31

To cultivate this English Musical Renaissance, there had to be a training ground for its future contributors. Grove utilized his prior experience on the Prince of Wales’s fund-raising team to bring his school to fruition, with three events attended by royal patrons. The Duke of Edinburgh, Duke of Albany, and Prince Christian solicited funding from wealthy citizens to build a “Central Public Institution” that would rival the great conservatories of the continent, consistently citing the “civilising element” of classical music and the fact that England had indeed been a musical nation in the past. However, this idea of early British musical supremacy that had simply lay dormant for several hundred years may have been taken too far. For instance, the Duke of Albany and Grove purported that *Sumer is icumen in* was the germ of all music that followed, including Handel oratorios, Beethoven symphonies, and Wagner operas, because they too explored nature’s sights and sounds through music. Stradling and Hughes write, “Thus, Grove at a stroke dispossessed Germany’s musical culture of its ‘Germanness’. Henceforth the Germans could only boast that their music was originally ‘Made in England.’”32 After a few

---

32 Ibid., 23.
more fund-raising efforts publicized (and spoken at) by the Prince of Wales and other nobility outlining the unifying, civilizing effects of a truly British musical culture, the RCM opened in 1883 with Grove as its director.³³

By providing a heightened level of musical education, Grove could ensure that his vision was brought to fruition. The term English Musical Renaissance was also carefully chosen. It calls to mind the Elizabethan Era and the age of Shakespeare, which was a source of pride for contemporary British citizens and lent credibility to Grove’s mission. It also recalled England’s previous golden age of navigation, exploration, colonization, the establishment of England’s Protestant freedom, and the defeat of the Spanish Armada.³⁴

Approximately a decade after the English Musical Renaissance began in earnest with the opening of the RCM, and as tensions with Germany were heating up in the years leading to World War I, Cobbett started his Phantasy Competition. Cobbett wanted to contribute to the reestablishment of a distinctly British musical culture that turned away from French and German influences as well. He asked composers specifically to turn to what he considered to be the last great national compositional style: the phantasy/fantasy (or fancy). These were typically chamber works from the last time England “led the world in chamber music:” the Tudor-Stuart era up through the compositions of Henry Purcell (despite the fact that the genre and its characteristics were practically unknown to musicians at the time).³⁵ Written for viol consorts that noblemen would have in their homes—akin to the Victorian notion of having quartet parties—the fantasies looked to a musical world that was not dominated by a single figure.³⁶ They spoke to accessibility and Englishness, two qualities that were important to Cobbett. Additionally, viol

---

³³ Ibid., 24-25
³⁴ Ibid., 35
consorts could be used in sports or wartime to enhance the ideals of fair play and comradeship, something particularly important before, during, and after the war.\textsuperscript{37}

In composing a “national” music, past compositional strengths were considered along with other English traits and sources. The chamber music boom that had steadily progressed reached a zenith with Cobbett’s competitions, which exclusively called for chamber works. The English considered the string quartet to be the pinnacle of difficult and intimate composition—very learned, serious, intelligent, and precise. Many felt that chamber music necessitated expressive restraint and self-control contrasted with thematic and emotional inspiration.\textsuperscript{38} As a result, the bulk of the chamber music composed during the English Musical Renaissance was written for strings, especially quartets. There were occasionally piano trios, piano quintets, or string quintets, but most of the efforts were string quartets, which appealed to the musical tastes of the day. Wind chamber music was not “suited to British compositional strengths,” apparently, although there could be one wind (typically an oboe) in combination with strings. The vast majority of works created during this period were quartets, quintets, and trios, along with duo sonatas, program music (particularly for two instruments only), and phantasies.\textsuperscript{39} For Cobbett’s first competition, he received sixty-seven phantasy compositions alone. This trend continued for several years until the form eventually faded into oblivion.\textsuperscript{40}

His particular spelling of the term Phantasy was in fact a response to English nationalism. Cobbett aimed to strip away any association of the genre with German or French traditions (\textit{Phantasie, fantaisie}, etc.) and remain true to both the classical Greek origins of the word and

\textsuperscript{37} Ibid., 101.
\textsuperscript{39} Ibid, 16-22.
\textsuperscript{40} For more information on Cobbett’s Phantasy Competition, the submissions, and its winners, see Kathryn L. Lent, “Walter Wilson Cobbett and the English Phantasy” (M.M. thesis, Bowling Green State University, 2008).
English origins of composition. The commission had few limitations; all voices should carry equal importance, there was to be a recurring theme, and it should be under twelve minutes in length, with the possibility of several movements played *attacca*.

Over in America, British composers had yet another patron for their compositional efforts. Elizabeth Sprague Coolidge was a wealthy heiress, accomplished pianist, and contemporary of Cobbett. In fact, they were recipients of each other’s medals for service to chamber music. With her inheritances, she started The Berkshire Festival of Chamber Music in 1918 and placed a heavy focus on British chamber music. Also like Cobbett, she started a chamber music competition/commission, to which Rebecca Clarke submitted her Viola Sonata in 1919. While the work tied for first place, it greatly impressed Mrs. Coolidge, and she and Clarke became lifelong friends. While Coolidge traveled in England occasionally (her first visit after quite some time was in 1922) and was introduced to some up and coming British composers while there—most notably Frank Bridge who became her major protégé—not much is known about her motivations for featuring so much contemporary English music at her festival.\(^1\) With the governmental, educational, and patron support of British music both at home and abroad, the English Musical Renaissance was almost guaranteed not only to take hold but to flourish.

The three composers featured in this dissertation, Vaughan Williams, Clarke, and Bridge, all attended the RCM. Considering that Grove’s public fundraising efforts led to the opening of the RCM, it was he who led the charge on the Musical Renaissance, hand-selecting the teachers who would further the compositional development of the next generation of composers while championing the ideals of the movement. The three most important composition teachers of the English Musical Renaissance were Frederick Corder, Sir Hubert Parry, and Charles Villiers

---

While, for instance, Vaughan Williams studied with Bruch and Ravel for a short time, and it was common for composers to work briefly with other composers, these were their teachers at University. Vaughan Williams, Clarke, and Bridge all studied with Sir Charles Villiers Stanford (although Vaughan Williams also worked with Sir Hubert Parry). 42

While Vaughan Williams was the only composer here specifically to study with Sir Hubert Parry (1848-1918), it is likely that the others interacted with him, and Parry’s contribution to the English Musical Renaissance is significant. After Grove’s fall from grace due to personal circumstances, Parry took over as the director of the RCM in 1895. He applied to study with Brahms in Germany, but it never came to fruition. Instead, he worked with Edward Dannreuther, a champion of Wagner who also was influenced by Liszt, Tchaikovsky, and Brahms. Parry’s mature style combined continental influence such as Germanic harmonic language and French cyclic procedures with the Anglican upbringing of his youth. His Scenes from Prometheus Unbound (1880) is regarded by some as the beginning of the English Musical Renaissance due to its modernism. He cared deeply about musical scholarship and the study of history, philosophy, and evolution, which affected his opinion on music history. His attraction to “social Darwinism” led to the belief that music should grow and evolve along with humanity. He championed ethnocentrism, tradition, and rigorous training, and wrote many articles and books on these subjects, yet his personal life was full of contradictions: politically conservative yet radical; religious yet completely opposed to organized religion; an advocate for musical change but a guardian of compositional tradition. His influence is seen not only on Vaughan Williams, but also Holst and Finzi. 43

---

42 Rodmell, Charles Villiers Stanford, 354.
Sir Charles Villiers Stanford (1852-1924), longstanding pedagogue at the RCM and orchestral conductor, studied with Reinecke in Germany. He composed prolifically for the Anglican Church, as well as orchestral, choral, operatic, and chamber music that echoed Mendelssohn and Brahms. His works featured nationalistic elements from his native Ireland by incorporating Irish folk tunes and setting Irish poetry. He composed largely in the diatonic realm, moving away from what he dubbed the “crushingly chromatic” language of Wagner. Even so, he straddled both sides of the Brahms-Wagner controversy, and appreciated the work of Franck, the Russians, and late Verdi. At his core, Stanford was a strict formalist and a traditionalist, speaking out against what he believed to be the “insanity” of modern music in progressively extreme language as he aged. He didn’t think ugly music should be composed to illustrate an ugly character or situation. As a result, he detested the work of the Second Viennese School.

As a teacher he was direct and at times very harsh, and he did not mince words when it came to his critiques. He was generally kinder to the few women he taught, claiming he did not feel comfortable taking his coat off and shouting at them, but was completely opposed to women obtaining degrees in higher education—even giving speeches and writing letters to The Times on the subject.

Despite his methods and formal/tonal conservatism, Stanford clearly encouraged his students’ originality. He wrote a composition treatise simply called Musical Composition, whose final chapter articulates his ideas about fostering the creativity of composers. As a composition manual, there are conventional overviews of counterpoint, harmony, form, and orchestration.
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46 Rodmell, Charles Villiers Stanford, 352.
47 Ibid., 197.
When he cites existing compositions or provides musical examples, however, he generally only refers to Austro-German composers such as Beethoven, Brahms, Schubert, and Mozart, with an occasional reference to Palestrina’s counterpoint or Dvořák. Ever the formalist, and despite championing the cause of the English Musical Renaissance, he offers strong opinions about the rise of the Fantasy, stating that it is more difficult to compose and requires more focus than a typical multi-movement work because of the requisite thematic continuity of the form. Instead, composers should retrace the steps of their forefathers who have forged a clear musical path for them. In the last pages of his text (a chapter titled “Danger Signals”), he prizes originality and willingness to experiment with new ideas, but insists on absolute sincerity and nobility in the process. There is a consistent subtext that if anything is done to seem merely clever, it will lead to a terrible result. Notwithstanding his arch-conservative side, his students displayed great variety in their compositions and certainly did not merely copy Stanford’s style.

The traditionalist aspects of his style are clear in the progression of his composition lessons. All students began by writing modal counterpoint in the style of Palestrina, and only then “progressed” by echoing the styles of Mozart, Beethoven, and beyond. Interestingly, writing baroque counterpoint in the style of Bach was not emphasized at all—Stanford asserts that Bach surely began by writing modal counterpoint, as his students should as well—but he does praise Bach for his prowess in variation technique and text setting. For Stanford, modality was especially important. Rodmell writes,

The interest in modal writing shown by many British composers has generally been attributed to the folksong revival, but Stanford’s teaching demonstrated to his pupils that modes could not only be applied to a ‘pastoral’ style, but could be
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used to extend the harmonic and melodic palette in all areas. He thus reinforced
the idea that modal writing could be viewed as an alternative both to the loosening
of tonality pursued by Strauss and Schoenberg, and the interest in the exotic
shown by Debussy and Ravel. For composers looking to forge a distinctive
British style, at a time when the concept of national characteristics was taken as a
sine qua non, a thorough-going use of modes provided a means of expression yet
to be exploited consistently in mainland Europe.\textsuperscript{52}

This quotation sheds new light on the modal writings of all his students, Vaughan Williams in
particular. However, it is also clear that he did not want his students to be “one-trick ponies,” but
rather to experiment with new techniques. He encouraged Vaughan Williams, already clearly
competent with modal techniques, to go to Italy and hear opera at La Scala to broaden his
musical horizons. Tellingly, Vaughan Williams disobeyed him and went to Berlin instead.\textsuperscript{53}

Regarding another well-known student of his, John Ireland, “It is significant—and perhaps
ironic—that Stanford did not want Ireland to write in a neo-Brahmsian manner; he was aware
that the modern composer needed to have a broader palette than that of the recent Germanic
canon, and believed that an introduction to the modes was one acceptable way of achieving
this.”\textsuperscript{54}

Because Stanford’s own style and taste never expanded with the times, he was very vocal
about what he deemed the horrible music from the continent at the beginning of the twentieth
century. Of course, this had one supremely positive result: his distaste for “new music” often led
his students to become more interested in seeking it out and listening to it, further impacting their
compositional techniques.

\textsuperscript{52} Ibid., 370.
\textsuperscript{53} Ibid., 356-357.
\textsuperscript{54} Ibid., 356.
Ralph Vaughan Williams, Rebecca Clarke, and Frank Bridge

In the ensuing analytical chapters, I will address biographical details of the lives of Vaughan Williams, Clarke, and Bridge in relation to the compositional history of the selected works. For now, a brief background is pertinent, particularly regarding their education. Ralph Vaughan Williams (1872-1958) attended the RCM from 1890-1892 (during which time he studied with Parry) and 1895-1897 (with Stanford), but also studied at Trinity College, Cambridge from 1892-1895. He worked with Bruch in 1897 and Ravel in 1908. “At the same time he recognized that, creatively, salvation would be found, not in imitating foreign models, but in a regenerative use of native resources. This led him to English folksong, to Elizabethan and Jacobean music, and to a philosophy of musical citizenship, which he both practised and preached.”

He shared these interests with his very close friend and one-time classmate, Gustav Holst, and the two often critiqued each other’s works-in-progress. Vaughan Williams’s works vary widely, with significant contributions to orchestra repertoire, The English Hymnal, song, and chamber music.

His compositional life can be divided into five style periods. The first is the “long apprenticeship” until 1908, which focused on vocal and choral works, and culminated in A Sea Symphony. His early music is indebted to Parry, Stanford, and Elgar, and often features epilogues with a niente close. The Piano Quintet hails from this era. The second period from 1908 to 1914 culminates in “A London Symphony,” and shows extensive use of folk song, distinctive imagery (often nationalist), and “the achievement of a unified style,” as will be shown in the Phantasy.

---

Quintet. After this period, Vaughan Williams served in World War I as a wagon orderly with the Royal Army Medical Corps and later, an artillery officer. “Soon after the armistice he was made director of music for the First Army of the British Expeditionary Force, with responsibility for organizing amateur music-making among the troops. The impact of the war on his imagination was deep and lasting but did not express itself in an obvious protest or change of style; rather it is felt in a more intense inwardness.” Next were the inter-war works. During this time, his compositions were more visionary and expressive, culling inspiration from varied sources such as Bach, Holst, and Bartók. He was prolific during this time, composing works of all different genres simultaneously—masterpieces including the Pastoral Symphony and Fourth Symphony as well as three operas and “functional” music and arrangements (typically for the church)—to name a few examples. While he was not religious, some works composed during this time appear more overtly spiritual, possibly reflecting Holst’s influence. During the World War II years, his works became a bit more traditional, and returned to a mostly diatonic/modal language. His final period seems to reflect on old age, with a potpourri of homages, influences, and genres.

Rebecca Clarke (1886-1979) was born in England to an American mother and a physically and emotionally abusive German father, and had dual U.S./English citizenship throughout her life. She was a viola virtuoso, despite beginning her studies on the violin. Clarke attended the RAM at 16, but withdrew after her teacher proposed marriage. She later studied with Stanford at RCM as his first female student, but never completed her degree
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program there after her father banished her from the family home and she was forced to withdraw. The withdrawal led Clarke to travel the world as a violist to support herself and eventually spent the majority of her adult life in the United States. Additionally, Clarke was one of the founders of the Society for Women Musicians. She had very close friendships with Vaughan Williams, his wife, and Frank Bridge.

Her shorter solo or duo works, of which there are many, were largely written for herself or her friends to play. The best-known works, the Viola Sonata and Piano Trio, were both runners-up in the competitions for Elizabeth Sprague Coolidge’s Berkshire Festival of Chamber music, although many believed there was no way a woman could have composed those works (both were submitted under the pseudonym “Anthony Trent”). After impressing Coolidge by tying for first place, she became the only woman from whom Coolidge commissioned a work—and the only woman who had works performed at the Berkshire Festival from 1918 to 1938. She was greatly influenced by the works of Debussy, Ravel, Franck, and Bloch, whom she admired greatly. Clarke wrote the entry on Bloch for Cobbett’s Cyclopedic Survey of Chamber Music. While she was in the United States for both wars, scholars have speculated on the impact of World War I on her music. Regarding the Piano Trio, Calum McDonald writes, “Although Clarke never seems to have explained the impulse that gave rise to the work, the musical imagery which she employs strongly suggests that it may be a response to the experience of the Great War in which she, like so many survivors, must have lost many friends (perhaps,
given her half-German parentage, on both sides). In this regard her Trio is as powerful and troubled an artistic reaction as the Piano Sonata or Second Piano Trio of Frank Bridge.\(^6^5\)

Frank Bridge (1879-1941) studied at the RCM with Stanford under a scholarship. He was a reputable conductor and chamber musician, performing as a violist in the Joachim and English String Quartets and filling in for Henry Wood as conductor at the Promenade Concerts. He won the Cobbett Competition, had works commissioned by Cobbett, and was the protégé of Elizabeth Sprague Coolidge, who served as his patron for several years, enabling the premieres of many of his works in the United States. He is also well known for being Benjamin Britten’s composition teacher.\(^6^6\) He composed chamber music throughout his compositional career, which may be divided into four main style periods. His Edwardian period from 1904-1912 produced several orchestral works, where he demonstrated his penchant for melodic lyricism and avoidance of dense harmonies and textures. The transitional period from 1913-1924 presents a vast expansion of his musical language, in which he assimilates romanticism with increased chromaticism. The compositions combine “Delian Englishness” with traditional polyphony to expressive effect. His views on World War I and its effects on him likely had a strong impact on his stylistic development that led to his Piano Sonata (1924), which ushers in the progressive period from 1924-1932. Bridge had strong pacifist convictions, and the War facilitated a change in his compositional ideals from writing “conventionally appropriate” music that would appeal to a conservative audience to exploring intense chromaticism and manipulation of traditional forms. The helpful and guaranteed financial backing from Coolidge helped to foster this progressive period, and during this time, he explored styles and techniques outside of his world, including the

\(^{65}\) McDonald. “Rebecca Clarke’s Chamber Music,” 20.

compositional techniques associated with Viennese expressionism. From 1933-1941, he reverted to a largely Classical style, which emphasized purity of form and conciseness of technique.\textsuperscript{67}

\* \* \* \* \*

At the turn of the twentieth century, the mission of the English Musical Renaissance was in full bloom, born from a thriving chamber music culture in England and both a political and educational aim to reinvigorate English musical culture. The composers of the works analyzed in this dissertation all studied with Charles Villiers Stanford at the Royal College of Music, a German-educated, conservative teacher who increasingly resisted the new techniques displayed by his students and other leading musicians of the day. This study begins with the early works of Vaughan Williams, the first quintessentially “English” composer of the 1900s; resumes with the after-effects of War represented in Rebecca Clarke’s post-War musical language; and concludes with Frank Bridge’s string quartet from his third compositional period, completed in 1927, the year he undertook the private tutelage of England’s next emblematic musical figure: Benjamin Britten. The different narrative approaches for each composition were guided by the events of each piece as opposed to applying a predetermined analytical model to the music at hand. Accordingly, Chapter Two provides a short history of the field of musical narrative, its varying approaches, and its salient critiques.

CHAPTER TWO: A BRIEF HISTORY OF AESTHETICS AND NARRATIVE THEORY

The Origins of Musical Narrative

The debate over whether instrumental music does or does not have inherent meaning has existed for over two centuries. Both composers and music critics engaged in this discussion even as the rise of program music and character pieces evolved over the course of the nineteenth century. It is the conviction that musical meaning exists and can be traced throughout a composition that led to the analytical subfield of musical narrative. This chapter will outline some of the historical, musical, and philosophical grounds for musical narrative throughout the nineteenth and twentieth centuries; the resurgence of musical narrative in the late twentieth century; critiques of the field; and why and how I will incorporate a narrative perspective into the chamber music examined in this study.

In Michel Foucault’s The Order of Things, he writes of the general philosophical shift after the Classical episteme (mid-seventeenth and eighteenth centuries) from a taxonomic, ordered way of thinking and creating to an interpretive method incorporating history and semiology.¹ In the realm of music criticism, this manifested itself in an increased focus on expression, aesthetics, feeling, and subjectivity. Writings about music evolved from explaining what precisely occurred in the music and how it was achieved—such as Johann Mattheson’s series of articles in the first half of the 1700s focusing on formal procedures and technical aspects of the music, or the writings of Rameau or Marpurg—to a more abstract consideration of

---

expression and aesthetics. The seminal review of Beethoven’s Symphony No. 5 by E.T.A. Hoffmann pointed to the exquisite expressiveness and emotionality inherent in an untexted musical genre, enabling a trend of narrativistic interpretations of music. This review and subsequent shift in music criticism upended the Kantian notion that music was the lowliest form of art, incapable of its own expression and merely toying with feelings. Romanticism directed musical and philosophical thought from objectivity toward the subjective narrative impulse, serving as a key precursor to what we think of as music-narrative theory today.

As the nineteenth century progressed, music criticism became less reliant on structural attributes, with reviews and program notes eschewing technical details almost completely to favor expressive content and extramusical imagery. This led to a debate between the Hanslickian formalists and the Wagnerian camp, or *Vom Musikalischeschönen* versus *Oper und Drama*. Eduard Hanslick (1825-1904) believed that absolute music was a higher art form than programmatic or texted works, because references to the extra-musical detracted from its

---

2 Naturally, a proper exploration of the history of music criticism and aesthetics lies outside the scope of this study, which further broadens through its inexorable linkage to other fields including hermeneutics, philosophy, psychology, and semiotics, among others. The Grove articles on “Hermeneutics” and “Criticism” serve as useful points of departure, identifying Schleiermacher as the principal architect of nineteenth-century hermeneutic circle, and pointing to Rochlitz’s *Allgemeine Musikalische Zeitung* as the cornerstone of musical hermeneutics (largely thanks to Beethoven’s revolutionary compositions). Schumann carried on the tradition with the start of his *Neue Zeitschrift für Musik* in 1834, and expressive writings about music began to appear as program notes for concerts across Europe and Hans von Wolzogen’s guides to Wagner operas. A.B. Marx (in his *Berliner Allgemeine musikalische Zeitung*) and Wilhelm von Lenz (in *Beethoven et ses trois styles*) stand apart as two critics who attempted to express imagery with empirical evidence in terms of biographical or technical evidence in the music. The work of philosopher Martin Heidegger and his concept of “Dasein” colored the field of hermeneutics and criticism in the twentieth-century, along with Gadamer’s concepts of prejudgment and tradition, and Ricoeur’s acceptance of hermeneutics’ liberating potential for a text. The early twentieth century saw musicological writings by Kretzschmar, but the field waned as an interest in positivism took over techniques of music analysis. Carl Dahlhaus’s *Foundations of Music History* began the work of bringing hermeneutics back into the realm of music criticism, leading to seminal works by Joseph Kerman, Leo Treitler, and Edward T. Cone. I include references to these works in my bibliography.


inherent beauty. For Hanslick, meaning arose from music by looking at its structure, tonal scheme, and internal mechanisms; it was purely “sounding form in motion.”\textsuperscript{5} Since its publication, musicological and critical interpretations of Hanslick’s approach have generally agreed that musical form and structure were incapable of expression. More recently this mindset has softened a bit; now for example, when we invoke his methods, over a hundred years removed from \textit{Vom Musikalisch-Schönen}, we look to the text itself to support our ideas of “acquiescence, resignation, or abnegation.”\textsuperscript{6} Wagner, highly influenced by Schopenhauer and advocating his own \textit{Gesamtkunstwerk}, believed art could not exist without meaning, and the lack of a text did not imply that music was incapable of expression. In keeping with Schopenhauer’s philosophy, Wagner considered music to be the ultimate vehicle of expression, and advocated for expansion of formal and harmonic boundaries in order to serve the music’s expressive needs. The “War of the Romantics,” as it was later dubbed, largely hinged on the debate over the preservation of formal ideals versus the generation of new forms. The conservative camp, with Hanslick as the primary critic and Brahms its chief compositional advocate, looked back to the formal developments of Beethoven as an unsurpassable peak and questioned the legitimacy of program music; the progressive camp (the “New German School”) included Wagner and Liszt, who saw Beethoven as a new beginning in music and believed that formal constraints could be eschewed in the service of expression. The heated debate was carried out in the forms of written manifestos, scenes at concerts, and within compositions themselves.\textsuperscript{7}


\textsuperscript{6} Nicholas Cook, “Theorizing Musical Meaning,” \textit{Music Theory Spectrum} 23, no. 2 (Fall 2001): 174. This quotation pertains to Cook’s explication of the approaches of such scholars as Robert Hatten, Peter Kivy, and Stephen Davies, among others.

In the twentieth century, the emphasis on musical hermeneutics diminished as positivist analysis gained traction. Carl Dahlhaus’s 1977 *Foundations of Music History* examined the rift between analysis that allowed for elements external to the work versus a methodology that only focused on internal musical characteristics. This renewal led to Joseph Kerman’s seminal 1980 *Critical Inquiry* article, “How We Got into Analysis, and How to Get Out,” on which he critiqued the music analysis discipline for its extreme positivism and called for analysts to move toward a more interdisciplinary, culturally cognizant consideration of music. In one section of the article, he takes Heinrich Schenker’s sketch of “Auf meinen Thränen spriessen” from *Dichterliebe* and points out what he deems to be its primary limitation: the lack of musico-poetic considerations. Schenker’s elimination of non-structural notes in his sketch eradicates almost all of the song’s chromaticism, which is textually motivated. Kerman notes that, while Allen Forte’s analysis does comment on the chromaticism, he acknowledges it as a unifying feature of the whole cycle, without commenting on its expressive significance. Kerman’s article not only encouraged hermeneutic analysis, but also incorporation of Theodor Adorno’s aesthetic theories of meaning as a social construct. Additionally, he drew on the work of Leonard B. Meyer for his critical methodology; in particular, he cites as exemplary his analysis of Beethoven’s Piano Sonata No. 26 in E-flat Major, Op. 81a, “Les Adieux,” wherein specific musical events in the introduction launch a variety of potentials that are either met or negated. While such a method has a narrativist bent, it also engages with structural details within the music to provide support for expressive interpretations. Responding to Schenkerian disciples, Meyer cautions them not to place too high an emphasis on hierarchical levels, because it may lead to a misunderstanding of musical meaning or representation. In “Les Adieux,” he remarks that the introduction may be

---

heard as a prolongation of the opening harmony, but that would be missing the point. Instead, the introduction’s true purpose is the continual delay of a resolution to the tonic harmony until after the sonata allegro form has already begun. This lack of resolution causes us to rethink the meaning of the introduction in spite of the presence of prolongation in a Schenkerian sense. In this way, Meyer’s work may be understood as an attempted hybridization of aesthetics and formalism.9

In the 1990s, Anthony Newcomb’s writings on action and agency in Mahler and Schumann spurred on the advent of current narrative theory carried on today by a number of analysts including Michael Klein, Robert Hatten, and Carolyn Abbate. Using conventional successions and paradigmatic plotlines from literature as a corollary to music, Newcomb traces identifiable elements of the music—e.g. tropes, topics, orchestral details—throughout the entirety of a movement or composition and notes how they affect change in the musical-formal structure. As we collect musical signifiers as the composition progresses, “The individual series of events, then, becomes a coherent story to the extent that we interpret its events according to sets of relatively conventional narrative paradigms.”10 Newcomb is careful to note that not all aspects of music participate in a narrative or are agential, but that music can represent various kinds of agencies. “…[I]nstrumental music can represent institutional agencies, such as city, country, court; it can represent natural agencies, such as storm, wind, thunder; it can represent some aspects at least of sentient agencies, such as animals…and, of course, humans…But much, perhaps most, musical representation is of internal characteristics ascertainable only by
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introspection—what most call expression of emotions and feelings.” For Newcomb, it is up to
the analyst to uncover to whom these expressions are attributed, how are they represented, and at
what level of specificity. The difficulty with this is that we cannot associate musical agency with
one particular gesture, timbre, or harmony—it is a combination of elements all coming together
to make their presence known, and how the paradigmatic plotline (such as a classical formal
structure) is affected by these agents.

Newcomb goes on to describe his methodology, wherein he explores an entire piece to trace
the constantly shifting elements and outlines the specific musical attributes that lend the selection
a distinctive narrative quality. This quality is not a description of the piece, its composer’s
intentions, or the specific performance. Rather, it is the analytically imagined agency that
exhibits these traits. Newcomb tracks the expressive qualities he observes in the music and
relates them to one another as the music moves forward in time, all combining to weave a
narrative of agency and expression. This approach of collecting musical data, interpreting it via
cultural, topical, allegorical associations, and then connecting the musical events in a linear time
sequence was highly influential to the next wave of narrative theorists.

* * * * *

11 Anthony Newcomb, “Action and Agency in Mahler’s Ninth Symphony, Second Movement,” in Music and
12 Ibid., 134.
13 For more on Newcomb’s approach, see his “Schumann and the Marketplace: from Butterflies to Hausmusik,”
Archetypes and Mahler's Ninth Symphony,” in Music and Text: Critical Inquiries, ed. Steven Paul Sher
(Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 61–88; and “Action and Agency in Mahler's Ninth Symphony,
Lawrence Kramer has written extensively on musical hermeneutics and The New Musicology. The first chapter of his 1990 book, *Music as Cultural Practice, 1800-1900*, is titled “Tropes and Windows: An Outline of Musical Hermeneutics,” and succinctly outlines his hermeneutic approach to music. He aims to show us how “hermeneutic windows”—ways to see the potential interpretation of a non-discursive text or music—are used to deploy an analysis in any sort of interpretive argument. A hermeneutic window is an entry point from the objective, surface-level musical text into a hidden, deeper meaning. Kramer posits three ways to open a hermeneutic window, listed from most to least explicit. The first is the use of textual inclusions, or any text explicitly associated with the work, be they program notes, evocative titles, even expression markings. Next are citational inclusions, which are less explicit references to other musical works or art works (what Klein might call an “intertext”). The third, most implicit window is a structural trope, “a structural procedure, capable of various practical realizations, that also functions as a typical expressive act within a certain cultural/historical framework.”

There is no “formal discovery procedure” to locate these tropes, which contributes to the critique that hermeneutics is too subjective for use as an analytical tool. That said, Kramer does provide some guidelines, stating that these structural tropes often occur during “problematic” moments in the music, where tensions and formal difficulties become manifest. Faced with an analytical challenge, we can attempt to understand it in connection to other musical or non-musical affiliations. Interestingly, Kramer invites comparisons and intersections between musical and
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non-musical artworks, and allows them to elucidate one another, but does not imply that the two disparate works respond to or are aware of one another. This leads to Kramer wanting to provide a “text” for a work that previously did not contain one, and relying on language to understand and interpret music. Kramer relies heavily on interdisciplinary correlation in order to interpret the problems presented in various compositions, rather than a formalist approach to the music that is then related to other art forms and media.\textsuperscript{15}

\textit{Carolyn Abbate: Can Music be Narrative at All?}

Musicologist Carolyn Abbate has explored a wide range of fields including Wagner’s operas as well as the subfield of musical narrative. Her 1992 book, \textit{Unsung Voices: Opera and Musical Narrative in the Nineteenth Century}, presents perhaps the clearest exposition of her approach. Abbate is concerned with whether or not music even has the power to be narrative, or at least seriously questions whether it is a consistently narrative form. She also rightly calls into question the narrative bias that so often occurs in analysis. This bias can arise when an analyst uses a narrative lens and cherry-picks the music for moments that then contribute to an emergent musical story. She also seeks to discover “who” is the narrator in a composition, if there even is one, and to determine whether music is mimetic (showing) or diegetic (telling) in nature. To Abbate, music cannot be narrative unless a narrator is present, and since music is primarily a mimetic as opposed to a diegetic art, there is no narrator speaking from the outside recounting events to a listener or analyst. Rather, the music is showing us events in the present, where a narration is impossible. Merely outlining a sequence of structural music events cannot

\textsuperscript{15} Lawrence Kramer is a Distinguished Professor of English and Music at Fordham University. His extensive work in literary theory strongly influences his work in literary-musical relations and critical musicology.
comprise a narrative. However, there are truly narrative moments, and they tend to occur when effects of distance and “the past” interrupt the linear unfolding of music, as in her analysis of Dukas’ *The Sorcerer’s Apprentice.*\(^{16}\) In this way, her approach dovetails nicely with Kramer’s idea of structural tropes occurring at analytically problematic moments in the text and appearing more as a disruption than anything else.

In applying her methodology, Abbate looks to operatic moments and program music. Her chapter addressing Wotan’s monologue in act II of *Die Walküre* addresses the problematic idea that when operatic characters are singing, they are reliable storytellers. It is the musical accompaniment to Wotan’s story that acts as a narrator, commenting on the action and alerting others that Wotan is not being truthful. Kramer’s review of *Unsung Voices* praises the analyses of opera, but questions the veracity of the narrative assumption in regard to program music.\(^{17}\) Both analysts tend to think of the narrative impulse in music as a “disruption” from some sort of pre-established norm. While Abbate primarily examines texted works or program music, as in the case with *The Sorcerer’s Apprentice*, her work is influential for my research because of her critical view of narrative. Her wariness of whether music can have a narrator stands as a necessary corrective to narrative bias. At the same time, her own “analyses” largely avoid structural considerations. My approach seeks to employ a narrative lens that emerges from and is grounded in the music-structural evidence. Crucially, my analysis of the Rebecca Clarke *Piano Trio* in Chapter Four centers on the music’s ability to have a past tense or narrate in some way. Abbate’s careful work on this concept in particular weighed heavily in attempting to isolate the specific ways in which Clarke’s work may be construed as pointing to a nostalgic past.
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Susan McClary’s 1991 book, *Feminine Endings: Music, Gender, and Sexuality*, calls the indisputably gendered ways of discussing music to the fore, and why they can be so problematic. She covers many feminist topics in the book, focusing on social and musical constructions of gender, the gendered terminologies in music theory, gender and sexuality in musical narrative, music as gendered discourse, and discursive strategies of female musicians and composers. What permeates much of the book is the notion that gender and sexuality as social constructs are applied to the music, not that music itself exhibits these traits.

McClary’s 2000 book, *Conventional Wisdom*, looks at musical and formal conventions and how they intersect with cultural norms and ideals, in attempting to provide models for notions of musical meaning. At its best, McClary’s work shines a light on the world of musicology, society at large, and the societal constructions that influence our understanding of the music we hear. It treats the music as a text to demonstrate how artists responded to their culture, and also as a reflective device that conforms and corresponds to societal pressure. One cannot deny that gender and culture play a major role in the composition and reception of music, and that is why her methodology is important for this study, particularly when a chapter is devoted to a work composed by a woman in the early twentieth century. While some work has been done on aspects of feminism in Clarke’s compositions (especially by Bryony Jones, Liane Curtis, and Marianne Kielian-Gilbert) and has factored into my consideration of the Piano Trio,
my hermeneutic window of choice into this piece ended up being based more on historical, stylistic, biographical, and pitch-structural rather than feminist grounds.18

Robert Hatten: Semiotics, Tropes, and Topics

In Hatten’s semiotic approach in his books *Musical Meaning in Beethoven* (1994) and *Interpreting Musical Gestures, Topics, and Tropes: Mozart, Beethoven, Schubert* (2004), he analyzes the relationship between sound and meaning in both a structuralist and hermeneutic way. Opposition and imbalance are of utmost concern, and valuing those oppositions in terms of their markedness leads to an emergence of meaning. Borrowed from linguistics, a marked term affirms the presence of something particular, emerging from an asymmetrical opposition. A basic example of this is the opposition between major and minor modes in music. The minor mode, used less often, carries a specific connotation in frequently conveying the tragic or sad. Its opposite, the major mode, can convey any number of expressions, and it does not necessarily mean non-tragic. The norm in key relations for a work in the common-practice period would be for a modulation from major I to major V. If, instead of moving to V, it modulates to ♭ VI, this modulation would be marked, as it is unexpected and non-normative.

A major component of his analysis has to do with expressive genre, represented graphically in several chapters. An expressive genre considers the work as a whole, plotting its dramatic trajectory based largely on mode (major/minor) and style (low/middle/high). Given its
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generality, in order to arrive at which expressive genre a work embodies, Hatten proposes consideration of topics, tropes, and musical gestures. The in-depth approach to musical gesture is a large part of Hatten’s 2004 study titled *Interpreting Musical Gestures, Topics, and Tropes: Mozart, Beethoven, Schubert*. A musical topic is a style type with strong correlations and a range of interpretation, and is often identified by “tokens” of the style. A French overture topic, for instance, can be identified as a stately tempo with a proliferation of dotted rhythms and occasionally, trumpets. All of these tokens do not have to be present for us to associate a section of music with a certain topic; but once we recognize it, it generates extramusical or even intertextual associations. The merging of two musical topics results in a musical metaphor, or trope, that requires critical interpretation to identify a possible musical meaning. Gesture is an “energetic shaping through time,” bringing a systematic, stylistic, or symbolic meaning to a composition. Hatten cites a “sigh” gesture, which typically has two distinct associations—an expression of grief (*Empfindsamer* style) or one of graciousness (*Galant* style). The use of a musical gesture such as this enhances our hermeneutic interpretation of a piece, as we must interpret what it is really supposed to signify. These gestures may be spontaneous, thematic, dialogical, rhetorical, or tropological.¹⁹ When these smaller musical gestures become motivic, they help an analyst identify the expressive tone and, hopefully, the range of signification inherent in a work.

The identification and analysis of all these separate thematic components helps us arrive at the larger expressive genre of a composition, be it transcendent, triumphant, tragic, gallant, tragic-transcendent, and so forth. While these elements can cause us to have expectations of a genre, it is up to the composer to confirm or deny those expectations.

Hatten’s brief discussion of intertextuality concerns itself with various types of appropriation. He uses the “Heiliger Dankgesang” from Beethoven’s Op. 132 to make his point, citing the juxtaposition of Renaissance (modal, hymn texture) with the Baroque (trills, ceremonial character, stately character, contrapuntal). These two styles are marked in contrast to the Beethovenian tradition, and also make a correlation to reverent prayer, liturgical function (from Renaissance), and dance (Baroque). Hatten’s work in this analytical subfield represents a broad conceptual approach that focuses on large-scale types/norms rather than detailed analysis.

Michael Klein: Intertextuality and Culture

Michael Klein, along with literary theorists, claims that one cannot approach a text without bringing understandings and knowledge of other texts to the table. When we analyze a piece of music, or even hear it for the first time, we cannot help but hear associations to other compositions, topics, time periods, or styles, and they all work together to form our interpretation of a piece’s meaning. For Klein, influence implies “intent or a historical placement of the work in its time or origin,” while an intertext “implies a more general notion of crossing texts that may involve historical reversal.” Related to this, it is important to recognize that Klein’s definition of trope is different from Hatten’s and Kramer’s. To Klein, a trope within an intertextual context is a sign or group of signs in one text that is a transformation of signs from another text. Hatten defines a trope as the intersection of two musical topics, for which critical interpretation is required to ascertain a potential meaning; Kramer’s tropes are structural moments in the music that function as an expressive act within a cultural or historic framework, and are often points
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where musical tension or formal abnormalities invite closer analytical inspection. While Klein generally agrees with them, he tends to be more cautious in his claims for an intertext with a particular work. For example, citing an instance of *Sturm und Drang* in a Romantic work as an intertext with a Haydn Piano Sonata is a trivial observation, as that particular technique is ubiquitous throughout the eighteenth century. Likewise, Beethoven’s use of an Alberti bass is likely an evocation of his youthful training, not an intertext. Writing the “Heiliger Dankgesang,” on the other hand, is another story entirely, because of its two marked textures and styles that contrast with Beethoven’s late musical language, along with Beethoven’s documented illness shortly before composition, and the expressive markings notated in the music, among other elements. What Klein has in mind is a web of meaning. Around the particular composer and composition, we should consider many texts: those that are biographical, theoretical, historical, musical, cultural, and so forth. It is particularly important to consider the historical figure of “the composer” in a holistic way when approaching a piece. Gaining insight to their lives and worlds can definitely influence the way one interprets their works. Through consideration of all of these factors, there is no set “methodology” that Klein articulates, but rather an approach that does what a purely structural analysis does not do.

As part of the foundation for his approach, Klein invokes Northrop Frye’s narrative archetypes in his analysis (also to be seen in Byron Almén’s writings), along with consideration of musical plot. Listening to a composition along these lines, a story unfolds as an analyst engages in a dialogue with the narrative of the music. Generally speaking, Klein advocates a top-down approach: determine which story (or stories) the music tells you or which stories you wish to tell about the music, then locate and identify the musical aspects that support that story. While such discursive strategies are of utmost importance, that is not solely what will lend your story
credibility (compare Abbate on narrative bias discussed earlier). Using topics, musical 
metaphors, and perhaps most importantly, historicization, can help us arrive at a narrative, but a 
narrative without a story is no narrative. The potential problems one could find with this 
approach revolve around the analyst’s bias. If you go into a work with a narrative bias, it is 
possible to claim any number of things to try to support any narrative. One needs musical, 
cultural, stylistic, and, for my analyses, structural evidence, to mitigate this problem.

In his analysis of Chopin’s Ballade No. 4 in F minor, Op. 52, Klein utilizes Jean-Jacques 
Nattiez’s three narrative levels: the poietic level, which concerns biography and history; the 
immanent level, which is a theoretical approach; and the esthetic level, concerning how we 
approach a text.22 Klein’s analysis concerns involves the presence of a narrator, an interesting 
approach considering this is a main sticking point for narrativists across the board. Those who 
deny musical narrative as a viable course of analysis often cite the lack of a narrator or past tense 
in music. Klein suggests that music lies somewhere between mimesis (showing) and diegesis 
(telling) because it cannot actively show us events as they occur, nor can it be told by a narrator. 
Semiotician Paul Cobley asserts that a telling is also a showing, as the creator of a narrative can 
pick and choose which events to present. By finding a way around this issue, Klein can proceed 
with his analysis, in which he assumes the existence of a functional narrator. His analysis 
combines his own methodology with that of Hatten, and is concerned with both what and how 
the music signifies. In keeping with Hatten, he analyzes the Ballade’s expressive genre, explores 
intertextual relationships between the fourth Ballade and the other three, and, borrowing from 
Edward T. Cone, exploits the notion of apotheosis in his work. Drawing from Monelle, he

22 Michael L. Klein, “Chopin’s Fourth Ballade as Musical Narrative,” Music Theory Spectrum 26, no. 1 (Spring 
7-39.
investigates issues of temporality to posit a theory of lyric versus narrative time that leads to an apotheosis, and finally, he explores the affective trajectory of the fourth Ballade.

The most important take-away from Klein’s analysis is that the analyst or critic has an intuition about the meaning(s) of a text, and then moves toward the structural and cultural underpinnings of that meaning. In arriving at his analysis, Klein mediates his narrative intuition and the structure of the music, while adapting the semiotic theories of Hatten and Monelle. Critics of narrative analysis might say that Klein’s intertextual analysis starts from too subjective a place, but that is how most people respond to music upon a first listen—they hear the story they want to hear. If I hear a particular composition as tragic, that response is valid. Once I find musical, cultural, historical, and/or biographical cues to explain how the work is tragic, this narrative reading is no longer arbitrary. Accordingly, this study aims to strike a balance between structuralism and narrative, and negotiate objective and subjective perspectives. I argue that following one’s analytical and expressive intuition is a perfectly legitimate starting place for a narrative analysis. Like Klein, I want to tell stories about music, and the story I want to tell has to be supported by a range of valid evidence.

*James Hepokoski and Warren Darcy: Narrative Forms*

In their 2006 *Elements of Sonata Theory: Norms, Types, and Deformations in the Late-Eighteenth-Century Sonata*, Hepokoski and Darcy categorized a daunting list of sonata-form movements into norms and types. Their narrative approach to these formal constructions is clear, demonstrated by their use of specific terms such as “action zones,” “juggernaut caesura,” “TR rhetoric,” and the like. The act of establishing a series of norms and deformations that in
essential ways rests on a series of related metaphors implies a narrative impulse. If we, as analysts and listeners, go into a composition with predisposed ideas about our musical expectations and are instead greeted by a specific “deformation,” this would provide a marked moment, a structural trope, or a hermeneutic window into the individual narrative in the composition. As opposed to musicologists who look more to social constructions to inform their analysis and understanding of music, Hepokoski and Darcy are structuralists through and through. At the same time, they lend a narrative impulse to the purely musical, because the sonata, as form and process, is a story of thematic and tonal elements. There are (at least) two themes, two key areas, and they may be construed as engaging in a battle for supremacy. It is possible and, in specific instances under specific conditions, advantageous to anthropomorphize the events in a formal construction, particularly one which is so prevalent and has undergone so many developments throughout history (pun intended). Since we have heard this same musical story told so many different ways, there exists the potential for a narrative bias because we have a set of musical expectations. Hepokoski and Darcy outline those expectations, provide examples of compositions that deny those expectations, and address what those denials mean in the grander analytical scheme.

*Byron Almén: Narrative Archetypes and Transvaluation*

Byron Almén’s 2008 book, *A Theory of Musical Narrative*, attempts to present a complete method for narrative analysis. More so than Hatten or even Klein, Almén relies on literary theory and criticism to find meaning in music.
Because “narrative” is fundamentally literary by nature, it is difficult to apply to music. Critics have written for centuries about how best to talk about music and its meaning when language falls short. Relying on literary theory might plunge us deeper into that hole. To avoid this, Almén adopts a “sibling model” to narrative theory where it is applied to music, which posits that narrative pertaining to music and literature are distinct media sharing a common foundation. Narrative can explain the inner workings and potential results of conflict between elements, but it must consider music’s own “syntactic potentialities.”

For Almén, narrative emerges after transvaluation, a term borrowed from semiotician James Jakób Liszka. Transvaluation occurs when “…a preexisting hierarchy of a system of signs is subjected to change over time; this change, filtered through an observer’s design or purpose, is interpreted as being isomorphic to a change applied to a cultural hierarchy…Thus, narrative tracks the effect of transgressive shifts or conflicts on a prevailing cultural system, as inflected by that which is important to the observer.” An analyst starts organizing a system of signs—topics, tokens, tropes, all of which are inherent in the music—and observes the processual changes. These changes are then filtered through the analyst’s subjective purpose and applied to a cultural standard. Further factoring in cultural factors and experience, such an enhanced approach to analyzing musical structure can then be used in supporting an interpretation.

After explaining his take on markedness, syntax, and value throughout his book, Almén revisits transvaluation, now focusing on the resultant confrontation and crisis. This is brought about by a transgression that introduces marked elements. As an analyst highlights the interactions between the “higher order” and the “transgression,” the biggest difficulty with Almén’s method emerges: we must choose which system of signs to which we are most
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sympathetic. Analysis of this sort features three levels: agential, in which the semantic units are identified and characterized; actantial, in which the relationship between the semantic units is defined; and narrative, interpreting the interactions of these units in relation to a drama between an order-imposing hierarchy and a transgression, eventually leading to a classification as one of Northrop Frye’s narrative archetypes. These are: romance (victory + order), irony (defeat + order), tragedy (defeat + transgression), or comedy (victory + transgression). Almén’s methods place great weight on the events in the musical structure, whether they be melodic, harmonic, formal, or topical. He then uses those events to situate the musical story on his adapted map of Frye’s narrative archetypes, reflecting the piece’s specific discursive and interpretive strategies. As the music progresses, it may move along the map in accordance to the constantly shifting hierarchy of the musical events, but at its conclusion, we can point to structural occurrences in the music that correspond to an ironic, romantic, comedic, or tragic narrative reading. However, because of choosing what exists as order and transgression, this approach allows for a good deal of subjectivity despite its reliance on musical structure.

* * * * *

Critiques of Musical Narrative

The field of musical narrative is hardly immune from critiques. Most critical assessments home in on the high level of subjectivity and arbitrariness that ascribing a story to music might invite. The New Musicologists fundamentally questioned the sole reliance of analysis of musical structure from inside the text to the exclusion of other factors from outside the text. Musical narrative is one attempt to respond to this analytical call to arms by incorporating myriad factors
from outside of the composition itself to assist in illuminating the signifying potential in the structural and harmonic events of the music. The main criticism of the cross-disciplinary nature of narrativity in particular is that too much emphasis can be placed on forcing a story onto the music as opposed to using the musical structure to uncover a possible reading, and the result can be too subjective. This approach leaves some wondering where musicology ends, analysis begins, and if the move away from formalism is also a move away from analytical rigor.

Nicholas Cook’s 2001 article, “Theorizing Musical Meaning,” takes the developments of the “New Musicology” to task, pointing out that despite all the advances in the field throughout the 1990’s, we may still be missing the mark. After Joseph Kerman’s call to step away from positivism and toward a more interdisciplinary, cultural consideration of music, Cook asserts that musicologists overcompensated by ascribing cultural and socially constructed meaning to music without adequate support from the music itself.

The proposed “problem” with musicology at the turn of the twenty-first century goes back much further to the previously mentioned opposing aesthetic theories of Eduard Hanslick and Theodor Adorno. While these two aestheticians were by no means contemporaries, their theories outline the two seemingly irreconcilable approaches to musical meaning: the neo-Hanslickian approach, in which one finds meaning inherent in the musical form and structure; and that of the neo-Adornians, who posit that meaning is a social construct. The New Musicology tended toward the Adornian approach, denying that there was any purely musical meaning.

As Cook recounts, Hanslickian formalism arose as a critique of the New German School in the late 1800’s, as composers disregarded Classical melodic and formal norms to enhance the expressive qualities of their music. For Hanslick, meaning arose from music through
consideration of its structure, tonal scheme, and internal mechanisms. For those who see meaning as musically inherent (e.g. Kivy, Hatten, Cone, Tarasti), it seems logical that they would integrate expressivity into a rigorous analytical process. Cook states that this is rarely the case, as these scholars simply substitute expressive terms for analytical ones. As an example, they will refer to an analytical description of a piece moving from A major to F minor as a progression from light to dark emotions.\textsuperscript{25} Of Hatten specifically, Cook notes that he will apply expressive meaning to a musical analysis, but never reformulate a structural analysis in relation to an expressive interpretation. The two sides, music and meaning, do not interact, complement, or counterpoint one another. The onus is placed on the score, not its hermeneutic implications.

On the other hand, socially constructed (and expressive, to an extent) meaning is passed down from Adorno’s theories in the first half of the twentieth century. Cook cites McClary as a main proponent of this tactic, claiming that musical meaning is largely comprised of conventions societies have “agreed to maintain.”\textsuperscript{26} This idea is not without precedent or legitimacy. McClary’s controversial “rape analogy” reading of Beethoven’s Symphony No. 9 could never have existed without Freud’s work in the field of psychoanalysis. Our readings cannot help but be influenced by our experiences and the world we live in. As long as there is a homologous relationship between interpretation and social construct, the analysis is plausible. However, if Adorno and his followers believe that music takes on meaning as a social construction, they stop short of explaining \textit{how} the music structurally supports these socially constructed meanings and if there are limits to what it can mean. Without an adequate theory of how and why music can structurally express meaning through focusing on the structural elements that emerge from the text, the interpretation may be seen as arbitrary.

\textsuperscript{25} Cook, “Theorizing Musical Meaning,” 175.
\textsuperscript{26} Ibid, 171.
Cook is saying that neither camp has adequately theorized how to have musically inherent and socially constructed or expressive meaning work together, but they must in order to present a credible analysis. Without balancing the objective and subjective aspects of analysis, you either have a structural analysis with superfluous expressive meanings pasted onto it or a narrative without empirical evidence to back it up.

Cook’s essay “Theorizing Musical Meaning” challenged leading scholars in the field of narrative, hermeneutics, and semiotics to address these concerns and posit how their methods steer a course between the Scylla of inherent meaning and Charybdis of socially constructed meaning to find a “third way” that allows for both analytical rigorousness and cultural context to coexist.\(^\text{27}\) In the preface to *Rethinking Music*, Cook observes that the New Musicology movement took away the notion of musical autonomy. That is, musicology and analysis rely too heavily on social and cultural concerns and blend into other disciplines within the humanities.\(^\text{28}\) Kevin Korsyn responds to musicology’s reliance on the binary opposition of being either “inside” or “outside” the piece of music, exploring either its internal attributes or relating it, as a closed unit, to other closed units. We can alternate between these two approaches, but never utilize both of them as once. He writes on this as part of an overarching concern of the text versus context debate in musicology, but it is certainly applicable to the specific approaches of several narrativists who search for musical and formal abnormalities over a backdrop of norms. These binary oppositions inevitably lead to notions of subordination or hierarchy, and the opposing stances of analysis versus history correspond to such an opposition. One is either in the music analyzing its form or outside of it, placing it into a historical context. Exploring ways to

\(^{27}\) Nicholas Cook, “Theorizing Musical Meaning,” 177.

\(^{28}\) Nicholas Cook and Mark Everist, Preface to *Rethinking Music*, eds., Nicholas Cook and Mark Everist, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), x-xii.
mediate the two is Korsyn’s point of departure, primarily focusing on Mikahil Bakhtin’s concept of dialogue as a way into solving this problem.29

As opposed to other subfields of music theory such as Schenkerian analysis or pitch-class set analysis, the field of musical narrative does not adhere to strict analytical guidelines or aim toward a pre-determined analytical goal. Kofi Agawu writes that semiotics and hermeneutics do not have an established set of beliefs or tenets, and the field becomes wayward and diverse. The lack of boundaries or regulations, or even an attempt to define what the subfield is attempting to accomplish in the first place, place musical narrative and semiotics in the position of having to prove their worth and academic validity.30

It seems that music analysis and post-structuralism are diametrically opposed, so how do narrativists grapple with this problem? How can they find a “third way”? Jacques Lacan, one of the most notable twentieth-century proponents of psychoanalytic theory providing a touchstone for post-structuralists, stated famously that the subject can only be a subject of the signifier. It cannot exist without language acting as its signifier; it is a no-thing.31 We can apply this handily to music, and claim that the use of a linguistic context, and therefore a cross-disciplinary approach, is essential to elucidate what music means. It cannot speak for itself, and therefore we must speak for it. Kramer writes that music does have referential power, as is seen with program music, but cannot make truth claims.

29 Kevin Korsyn, “Beyond Privileged Contexts: Intertextuality, Influence, and Dialogue,” in Rethinking Music, eds., Nicholas Cook and Mark Everist (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), 55-56. Also remarking on the problem of balance, whether from being inside or outside of the music or from a structural or cultural viewpoint, Arnold Whittall acknowledges that it is difficult to reconcile the tension between formal and hermeneutic interpretations, and the balance of pluralism and coherence is next to impossible. See Arnold Whittall, “Autonomy/Heteronomy: The Contexts of Musicology,” in Rethinking Music, eds., Nicholas Cook and Mark Everist (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), 101.
Yet to argue that meaning begins with a truth claim is merely to give a restrictive definition of meaning…. In taking up the hermeneutic attitude, we approached the text by assuming that it resists fully disclosing itself, that in certain important respects it is mute, and that we ourselves understand it at first in terms we must work to articulate. To put this another way, we approached the text very much as we would be compelled to approach a piece of “absolute” music. The hermeneutic attitude, which begins to assume its modern form at just about the time that instrumental music begins its cultural ascendancy, works by assigning to discourse the nondiscursive opacity that is supposed to belong to music. We enable the interpretation of a text by deprecating what is overtly legible and regarding the text as potentially secretive.32

For Kramer, music cannot express its meaning to us; rather, we must unlock its meaning through linguistic discourse. Taking a purely formalist approach and analyzing the music in a vacuum as the only text will not bring its meaning to light. In blurring the lines between musicology and in this instance, discourse, we are attempting to describe and understand music the only way we know how: through language and cultural context. Music cannot interpret itself, and musical units do not have “fixed lexical meaning.” Language does, for the most part, and it is the perfect medium through which musical signs can be described and interpreted.33

Post-structuralism cites the need for language and culture to shed light on “the subject,” or music in this case. For many of the musicologists writing in Cook and Everist’s Rethinking Music, the cultural context is an indisputable necessity. Korsyn’s intertextuality signifies “an impersonal crossing of texts, marking a shift towards a reader-oriented criticism.”34 Thus, one puts the text into context and they become unified, but these intersections do not provide a narrative bias. For Whittall, the move away from musicological positivism is welcome and necessary, as music was not composed in a vacuum and should not be analyzed as such. He quotes Kramer and says “musical autonomy…is a chimera; neither music nor anything else can

33 Agawu, “The Challenge of Semiotics,” 144.
34 Korsyn, “Beyond Privileged Contexts,” 56.
be other than worldly through and through.” If we want to serve the ideals of the New Musicology, we must find a way to balance an analysis of the text and the context of its creation, because it is impossible to call this field musicology if we resist engagement with the composer, a work’s composition, and the notion that a piece of music is conceived as a reaction to and direct product of the world from which it is derived.

The third way that Cook is seeking, that between the Scylla of inherent meaning and Charybdis of socially constructed meaning, seeks to take away the potential for arbitrariness in a narrative reading. We cannot assign a meaning to something for no reason whatsoever; there has to be at least one specific, available attribute that supports it. In relation to music, these attributes emerge through its performance. Indeed, music does not simply exist in a vacuum; it is always in a discursive relationship with someone or something, be it audience, performer, or interpreter. The interaction of music with its interpreter gives rise to meaning. In this way, we can look to the structural attributes of the music, but also engage our cultural views and experiences in a dialogue with it. With this idea, music does not have to have just one meaning, but the potential for unique meanings based on varying circumstances. In no way is a narrative reading of a composition claiming to expose the meaning of the music, it is merely a potential interpretation. There is much to be gleaned from a new and different perspective on any piece of music, just as in the evolving world of performance practice.

In truth, most narrative approaches allow for considerable subjectivity, despite attempts to state the contrary, and that may be seen as a flaw in this analytical technique. I do not consider this of a problem, as music is subjective and personal to begin with. My experience with a Chopin Ballade is different from my colleague’s, which is different from a pianist’s, which is

---

36 Ibid, 100.
different from a Polish composer’s. By extension, my analysis should be as well. Unless the composer is alive, they cannot tell us what story they are telling, and provided we can access both the meaning inherent in the music and our own, socially and experientially constructed meaning to arrive at a conclusion, we can tell the story that we think is communicated by and through the music. Lawrence Kramer writes, “Considered in isolation, a sforzando or a pungent dissonance, a melodic shape or a rhythmic profile, is just as neutral as a middleground linear progression. Signifying surfaces cannot simply be decoded; they must be interpreted before their signifying and expressive power can be released. And once one starts interpreting, there is nothing, literally nothing, that cannot assume a qualitative, signifying value.” Structure and interpreted meaning must work in tandem for any analysis to be worthwhile. For Kramer, perhaps criticism should be considered more heavily than analysis, but it is not to say that both structure and meaning cannot coexist in one analysis.

The decision to investigate these four compositions developed gradually through my work in the narrative field. I began work on the Vaughan Williams Phantasy Quintet to test the limitations of a narrative analysis in a chamber music context, in the absence of both traditional common-practice tonality and a conventional formal construction. Most narrative analyses address music from the common-practice period with relatively clear-cut forms in either a solo (character piece) or orchestral work. Because a narrative approach to the Phantasy Quintet proved illuminating, it seemed only natural to expand the scope to other compositions from this “problematic” time in music history.


38 Applying narrative to twentieth-century works is not without precedent. For further reading, see Michael L. Klein and Nicholas Reyland, eds., Music and Narrative since 1900 (Indiana: Indiana University Press: 2013).
Despite the vast array of compositional techniques during this time and across the four works to be studied, they share one commonality: they are all cyclic multi-movement compositions. This technique is most closely associated with works by César Franck, including the Piano Quartet and Violin Sonata, and disseminated widely by his student Vincent D’Indy, the founder of the Paris Schola Cantorum.  

In D’Indy’s treatise, he traces the origins of cyclic sonatas to Beethoven’s compositions, including the *Pathétique Sonata* and Symphony No. 9, and alleges that his teacher was the sole inheritor of and builder upon Beethoven’s cyclic tradition. D’Indy divided the generations of composers after Beethoven into two camps: those that broke with sonata form and failed to incorporate thematic development, and those who distilled the process into one of cyclic unity. Finding fault with such revered Romantics as Schubert, Mendelssohn, Chopin, and Schumann (his own nationalist views factored into this as well), D’Indy did face a stumbling block when it came to Brahms. After acknowledging Brahms’ compositional aptitude, he dismissed his work as being tedious and indigestible, among other critiques, thereby forging a direct path from Beethoven to Franck. D’Indy then discusses the attributes of a cyclic sonata: it must have a distinguishable theme that is consistently developed or undergoes variation and appears in most if not all of the subsequent movements; the development of the theme may be more nuanced within a movement than it is across movements; and the key scheme across movements should be incorporated into the cyclic design.

The selected British chamber works feature overt cyclic procedures, and not by simply utilizing one recurrent musical idea. Perhaps the most prevalent compositional procedure is a “motive chain,” whereby a motive or theme from the first movement will appear throughout, but

---

the second movement will put forth a new musical idea that will also undergo some sort of transformation in the third movement. This trend toward cyclicism was “in the air” at the time, with many composers exploring this unifying trait, but it is so explicit in all of these compositions that it opens up narrative implications. For example, the transformation of an expressively striking and strident theme from being an outlier in the formal scheme to a pastoral folk song in Vaughan Williams’s Piano Quintet in C minor limns an analytical and expressive tale; conversely, the lack of transformation of a recurrent theme can also tell a story, albeit a very different one, in Bridge’s post-War String Quartet No. 3.

My narrative approach incorporates historical aspects while also attempting to make sense of music that does not necessarily conform to common-practice tonal and formal conventions. The works chosen for this study weave compelling musical narratives of transformation (and, in one instance, an anti-narrative of non-transformation). Together, they shine a light on the fascinating yet largely unexplored chamber music of England at the outset of the twentieth century.

Even with the published work in this theoretical subfield, there is no exact methodology for my analytical path, or a blueprint for finding my hermeneutic windows. Rather, my approach entails a feedback loop of listening for the unique, even bizarre, marked moments, interpreting them in a more macroscopic structural context, determining possible biographical and/or cultural contexts motivating a significant musical moment, and how this moment affected change across the work as a whole. While the compositions here were written at a time where there was more tonal and formal freedom, and therefore fewer musical expectations, there will always be specific musical utterances that stand out as marked in relation to structural contexts established by the piece. I suggest that a narrative lens can act as a heuristic and provide an inroad to dense,
difficult works that realistically could be potentially subject to myriad analytical possibilities. These compositions resist categorization and would likely not benefit from an exclusively structural-taxonomic method of analysis. It seems fitting that music that resists placement into a specific category and does not follow prescribed formal and tonal “rules” should be examined through an analytical method that behaves in a similar manner.
CHAPTER THREE: INTERTEXTUALITY IN RALPH VAUGHAN WILLIAMS’S PIANO QUINTET IN C MINOR AND PHANTASY QUINTET

Attempted Thematic Transformation and Stylistic Synthesis in the Piano Quintet in C Minor

The frontiers of music are never clear cut: beyond its framing silence, beyond its inner form, it is caught up in a web of references to other music: its unity is variable and relative. Musical texts speak among themselves.¹

This crossing of texts, or intertext, can enrich our understanding of a work’s signifying potential. By opening up a musical text to both internal analysis and external contextualization, we can shed a more nuanced, multifaceted light on its hermeneutic potential. The concept of intertextuality stems from early twentieth-century philosophy, semiotics, and literary criticism, in the writings of Kristeva (who coined the term), Foucault, and Bakhtin, among others. For this chapter, my methodology draws on Michael L. Klein’s 2005 monograph Intertextuality in Western Art Music, the first complete study involving the application of this concept to musical compositions. Klein and Reyland’s follow-up co-edited collection of essays, Music and Narratives since 1900, is also crucial to my study, as the changes in musical language after the turn of the century necessitate a shift in our narrative perspective.²

It is important to note that the goal of musical intertextuality is not to prove compositional influences. Klein states, “Rather than view texts as links in a chain of influence, we can use the metaphor of a web to show that texts are interlinked in multiple directions.”³ Intertextuality does not concern itself with timelines; rather, it is a crossing of a multitude of texts that can open a text’s meaning in myriad ways. Its unregimented nature makes it difficult to define what does or

² For more information on the origins of intertextuality in the philosophical and semiotic disciplines, see Michael L. Klein, Intertextuality in Western Art Music, 2005.
³ Klein, Intertextuality in Western Art Music, 4.
does not constitute an intertext. It is possible to limit it solely to the works of one author, or to one specific period, or within a particular style. Alternatively, it is possible to open the text at hand to all time, or the entire canon. The intertext does not have to be limited to other musical compositions either. Rather, we can look to other contextual factors including the composer’s biography, historical events, literary connections, and social constructions as texts that can aid us in understanding music and what it signifies.

Two early compositions by Ralph Vaughan Williams will be analyzed through an intertextual lens: his Piano Quintet in C Minor, composed in 1903 with final revisions in 1905, followed by the Phantasy Quintet, composed in 1912 for the Cobbett Composition Competition. The Piano Quintet was finished before what is considered to be Vaughan Williams’s compositional maturity, and he withdrew several works from the time between leaving the Royal College of Music in 1895 and studying with Ravel in 1908.4 After a lengthy publication embargo on the Piano Quintet, it was published in 2003. The early works show the composer trying to find his own voice, and strong Brahmsian influences are felt here, no doubt due to the teachings of his primary instructor at the RCM, Sir Charles Villiers Stanford.5 I will use several intertextual associations in my formal and tonal analysis of this formative composition, including an examination of other works Vaughan Williams was composing simultaneously and their textual implications; the composer’s contemporaneous professional engagements; and his reuse of the same thematic material from this work later in life.

In contrast, the Phantasy Quintet, composed two years after his well-known Fantasia on a Theme by Thomas Tallis, is a work from the beginning of Vaughan Williams’s maturity. There

are curious similarities between motivic material employed in the Phantasy Quintet and leitmotifs from Wagner’s *Parsifal* that warrant an intertextual analysis, as well as the early English Fantasia genre and the form it took in the hands of composers during the English Musical Renaissance at the turn of the twentieth century.

The two pieces, written approximately ten years apart, share many traits: they are heavily influenced by German romanticism, particularly Brahms and Wagner, as a result of Vaughan Williams’s education at the RCM and abroad; they explore conventional forms such as ternary, arch, and sonata, with strong cyclic elements; and English folk and modal influence is strongly highlighted, a hallmark of Vaughan Williams’s compositional style. Despite these similarities, the narrative trajectories of these two works play out quite differently. I will show that the Phantasy Quintet effectively synthesizes these disparate compositional influences, while the earlier “student” work attempts to do so but is ultimately less successful. Perhaps the publication embargo was enacted because Vaughan Williams recognized this about the Piano Quintet, but the reemergence of its main theme in the 1954 Violin Sonata demonstrates that the piece remained important to the composer. Nevertheless, through researching the composer’s academic pursuits at the time of composition, it is apparent that the earlier work was pivotal in the discovery of his unique musical voice.

*    *    *    *    *
Piano Quintet in C Minor: Scotland, Rossetti and Stillness in the Face of Conflict

'Tis visible silence, still as the hourglass
- Dante Gabriel Rossetti

This early, initially unpublished, three-movement work by Ralph Vaughan Williams greets listeners with immediate Brahmsian drama. The cyclic sonata details the conflict and attempted reconciliation of three thematic “characters” associated with specific themes and structural functions introduced in the first movement: a Brahmsian first theme, an English second theme, and a mysterious interruptive theme. The latter is the chief cyclic agent throughout the three movements, which increases in importance and undergoes expressive transformation. There are several harmonic and textural oppositions put in place by the composer that act as supporting players alongside the thematic conflict, including minor versus major modality, flat keys versus sharp keys, polyphonic versus homophonic texture, and hexatonic poles.

Example 3.1 presents a form chart of the opening movement. The first movement’s sonata form begins with a lush, sweeping texture reminiscent of German romanticism. An aggressive tutti entrance outlining a descending minor tetrachord (motive A) and its upward-reaching thematic counterpoint (theme B) comprises the majority of the P-zone. These two motives, presented in the first measures of the composition, are reproduced in Example 3.2. Motive A features a descending stepwise motion through the minor tetrachord with a forceful, marcato quality. In contrast, theme B is defined by an initially upward trajectory, arpeggiated contour, and a legato expression, eventually leading to a scalar descent. These two contrasting ideas will

---

6 When referring to sonata form components, I will use the terms set forth by James Hepokoski and Warren Darcy in their 2006 book *Elements of Sonata Theory: Norms, Types, and Deformations in the Late-Eighteenth Century Sonata* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006). P-zone (primary tonal/thematic area), Tr (transition), MC (medial caesura), S-zone (secondary tonal/thematic area), EEC (essential expositional closure), ESC (essential structural closure).
### Exposition: mm. 1-198

**P-zone: 1-57**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Motive/Theme</th>
<th>Key</th>
<th>Expressive Quality</th>
<th>Interpretive Quality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>Motive A</td>
<td>c minor</td>
<td>Allegro con fuoco, ff, tutti</td>
<td>Dramatic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-17</td>
<td>Theme B (strings)</td>
<td>c minor</td>
<td>Softer, polyphonic, legato, arpeggiatic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-27</td>
<td>Theme B repeat</td>
<td>B major</td>
<td>Same as 3-17, higher register, marcato</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27-38</td>
<td>Motive A</td>
<td>f minor</td>
<td>Fragmentation, string/piano echo, marcato, piano descends in 8ves to d’?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39-57</td>
<td>Theme B (repeat of 3-17)</td>
<td>c minor</td>
<td>Strings in unison, piano accompaniment, ff, ensemble cohesion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Tr: 57-138**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Motive/Theme</th>
<th>Key</th>
<th>Expressive Quality</th>
<th>Interpretive Quality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>57-60</td>
<td>Reg. descent into TR proper</td>
<td>D major</td>
<td>Rapid dim. Tonality dissolves</td>
<td>Bright</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61-75</td>
<td>Theme B</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Repeats twice, climbing registraally</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76-84</td>
<td>Theme B</td>
<td>D major</td>
<td>Brillante, climbing registraally</td>
<td>Frenzied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85-102</td>
<td>“Motive A”</td>
<td>unstable</td>
<td>Sequenced 3-note pattern, pesante, stretto (con forza)</td>
<td>Sweeping, Brahmsian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103-125</td>
<td>Motives A and B</td>
<td>c# minor</td>
<td>Duet strings/piano on theme B. Tail of B isolated, descends registraally, ensemble cohesion</td>
<td>Resignation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125-138</td>
<td>Variant of A</td>
<td>c# minor</td>
<td>Piano solo, scalar descent to MC (f# minor triad)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### S-zone: 139-198

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Motive/Theme</th>
<th>Key</th>
<th>Expressive Quality</th>
<th>Interpretive Quality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>139-150</td>
<td>E major (cad. to c#m)</td>
<td>E major (stays in E)</td>
<td>Strings alone. Folk-inspired, dolce, derived from A, legato</td>
<td>English Folk Song</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150-159</td>
<td>“E major”</td>
<td>“E major”</td>
<td>Piano solo, cantabile</td>
<td>Rhapsodic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160-173</td>
<td>S and S₂ (layered)</td>
<td>S₁</td>
<td>Imitative among all instruments, espressivo, then pesante</td>
<td>Yearning, then mysterious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>174-181</td>
<td>S₁</td>
<td>S₂</td>
<td>pp, cantabile, gradual crescendo, sequencing upwards, gaining intensity</td>
<td>Mysterious, searching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181-186</td>
<td>S₁</td>
<td>INT</td>
<td>Largamente, cantabile, ff, tutti homophonic presentation of theme</td>
<td>Triumphant, romantic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>186-191</td>
<td>“S₁”</td>
<td></td>
<td>f# minor</td>
<td>Frightening, imposing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>191-199</td>
<td>E major?</td>
<td></td>
<td>E major?</td>
<td>Assertive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Example 3.1: Form chart of movement I*
Example 3.1, cntd.

**Development: mm. 199-282**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>199-242</th>
<th>242-269</th>
<th>270-276</th>
<th>277-282</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Motive/Theme</td>
<td>B, A, INT</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>INT, “A” variant</td>
<td>INT (retransition)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key</td>
<td>e minor</td>
<td>Unstable</td>
<td>D$#_7$ over C pedal</td>
<td>f minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressive Quality</td>
<td>A: marcato</td>
<td>Animando, appassionato, cantando, sequencing upwards, stringendo</td>
<td>tenuto, poco piu mosso, accented, ff</td>
<td>Accented, andante sostenuto, ff, unison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction of Themes</td>
<td>Theme B attempts to assert itself, repeatedly cut off by INT/motive A (contrary motion)</td>
<td>Ensemble cohesion, registral climax in 256, immediately descends, secondary climax attempted</td>
<td>INT disrupts second attempt at B prevailing, “A” variant from other sectional divisions takes over</td>
<td>INT sequences down from F to C, eliding with the return of A for recap. Bold and decisive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recapitulation: mm. 282-361**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>282-297</th>
<th>298-309</th>
<th>310-324</th>
<th>325-347</th>
<th>348-361</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Motive/Theme</td>
<td>A, B</td>
<td>S_1</td>
<td>S_2</td>
<td>A, mostly B</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key</td>
<td>c minor</td>
<td>$D_7$ major</td>
<td>“$D_7$ major”</td>
<td>C major/minor</td>
<td>“$D_7$ major”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressive Quality</td>
<td>$p$, tempo rubato, strings chorale style, almost no harmonic support from piano</td>
<td>$pp$, cantabile, andante sostenuto, thinner texture – only 3 instruments at once</td>
<td>poco animando, espressivo, gradually gaining strength and higher tessitura</td>
<td>dolce, molto espressione, harmonic support from piano, gradually fuller texture in strings</td>
<td>crescendo sempre, expressive hairpin dynamics, rapid ascent to $ff$ registral climax (vln C7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpretive Quality</td>
<td>Resigned, abnegation</td>
<td>Nostalgic, less self-assured as in exposition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Romantic, sweeping, attempt of victory</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Coda: mm. 362-388**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>362-368</th>
<th>368-377</th>
<th>377-388</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Motive/Theme</td>
<td>A, B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B, A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key</td>
<td>C major/minor</td>
<td>C major/minor</td>
<td>C major/minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressive Quality</td>
<td>Descent in register and dynamics, texture thinning</td>
<td>Motive passed between voices, even thinner texture</td>
<td>Bass plays last theme B (espress.), C-major chord in piano, bass descends on legato, $pp$ motive A. Tutti C-major triad at end, $pp$.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpretive Quality</td>
<td>Dying away, abnegation</td>
<td>Dying away, abnegation</td>
<td>Dying away, abnegation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Example 3.1: Form Chart of movement I**
Example 3.2: 1, measures 1-16, showing motive A in 1-3 eliding with theme B in viola, 3-16
generate almost all of the thematic material across the three movements, with one notable exception.

The sonata form of movement I is fairly straightforward, but there are notable diversions. There are clear delineations of the exposition, development, and recapitulation, and the subdivisions within the exposition as well. Aiding in this formal clarity, the individual sections are characterized by a movement toward cohesiveness as an ensemble with all instruments sounding the themes either homophonically or in unison, as opposed to their presentation antiphonally or in ensemble subsets. When this cohesion is finally attained, it leads to a tonal and formal “breakdown” into the next section.\(^7\) There is also a correlation between this cohesion and a climb toward a relatively high register, which is answered with a dramatic descent.

Despite Vaughan Williams’s tendency toward relatively simple, frequently modal scalar and chordal constructions throughout this movement, the tonal motion across entire sections is anything but standard. The P-zone, measures 1-61, is an extended sentential construction. After the homophonic exclamation of motive A, theme B takes over in the viola. This theme is passed around each instrument, eventually forming an antiphonal texture between strings and piano, leading the piano descent to arrive on a D half-diminished seventh chord (measure 38). After this collapse, all five instruments play a shortened restatement of theme B, the main theme of the P-zone, back in the original key of C minor (measure 40). The exultant, homophonic restatement is truncated by the destabilizing appearance of augmented triads and the register descends once again, leading to the transition. Theme B starts out as the main transitional theme, with the

\(^7\)An example of cohesion leading toward a “breakdown” can be seen in measures 40-57 of movement I, in which all five voices present the P-zone theme essentially in unison. The unification dissolves in measure 57, where all the voices descend from a high point, the triadic quality shifts from tonal major/minor to a tonally-ambiguous augmented, and the Tr section begins shortly thereafter in measure 61. More of these moments will be discussed in the chapter as they occur in the music.
melody handed off between instruments and climbing by half step to land on D major (measure 76).

As theme B is truncated, motive A asserts itself as the new transitional theme (measure 85, *forte pesante*). The descending motto sounds homophonically in the strings, reiterated successively up in half steps, and echoed by the piano. *Stretto* between the strings and piano on motive A begins in measure 97, gaining energy until the *fortissimo*, unified exclamation of the entire P-zone in C# minor in measure 102. The unification achieved during the peak of the transition is short-lived and the texture divides again, with the strings sounding together and answered by the piano. Motive A is repeated antiphonally several times as the transition comes to a close, first in the strings with an echo by the piano, gradually descending by thirds until measure 125. Here, the piano continues the descent on a varied motive A through the C#-minor scale. Instead of the descending minor tetrachord, the sixth scale degree is repeatedly skipped, removing the b6-5 gesture characteristic of the minor mode. The transition grinds to a halt harmonizing the outer voice melody on C#-B-G#-F#, landing on the MC (an F#-minor triad) as the registral low point (measure 135).

The opening of the sonata form first movement sets up relationships between motives A (descending minor tetrachord) and B (arpeggiated ascent concluding with a descending gesture) and an antiphonal versus homophonic texture between strings and piano. The P-zone features the two primary motives shared between the instruments, leading to a *tutti* presentation. This unified, C-minor statement quickly becomes tonally unstable, as the attainment of homophony signals the end of a formal section and P leads into Tr. The transition is chromatic and fragments the thematic material, culminating in a dramatic restatement of all the P-zone material up a half step in C# minor (measure 102). Vaughan Williams isolates and exploits the descending, stepwise
figure at the end of theme B (drawn from motive A) and repeats it at continually lower pitch levels, leading to a highly unusual medial caesura a tritone away from tonic beginning measure 135. Notwithstanding the change of key signature to 4 sharps, the S-zone takes its time in establishing a major mediant relation between C and E, tempering it through folk-song modality. In addition to the presentation of thematic material and formal divisions, it is also important to note the unconventional tonal path of the sonata form thus far. The P-zone, beginning in C minor, leads to Tr which, after traversing several keys, lands squarely on C# minor to prepare for S in E major, with what serves as an MC functioning as ii of E major and iv of C# minor. While a chromatic mediant relationship between P and S is not altogether cause for alarm in the early 1900s, it is rather less common to find it when the composition begins in a minor key. The transposition of P up a half step, an unexpected and marked tonal shift particularly due to the decisive unison return of P-zone material, will be balanced at the close not only of movement I, but also the entire composition.

Unlike the P-zone, which featured a declamatory motto before the main theme took over and often blended with it, S has two distinct independent themes. These are not entirely new themes, however, despite the dolce character they express (Example 3.3). The beginning of S1 is reminiscent of motive A with its descending, largely stepwise character, although one step is expanded to a third. However, there is a definite expressive and topical contrast to the opening motive of the Quintet, as the character of S1 is distinctly pastoral and pentatonic/modal, lending it a lilting, almost improvisational English folk-tune quality. S2, first appearing in measure 160,  

---

8 The relationship between P in C minor and S in E major constitutes a hexatonic pole, which consists of a major and minor triad a major third apart, sharing no common tones, and features semitonal shifts in all voices. It is accomplished via an LPL transformation in neo-Riemannian theory. Richard Cohn discusses its use in the portrayal of the uncanny in Wagnerian operas and late Romantic music. See “Hexatonic Poles and the Uncanny in Parsifal,” *The Opera Quarterly* 22 no. 2 (Spring 2006): 230-248; and “Uncanny Resemblances: Tonal Signification in the Freudian Age,” *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 57.2 (2004): 285-323. Hexatonic poles will factor heavily in my discussion of Vaughan Williams’s *Phantasy Quintet* later in this chapter.
Example 3.3: I, measures 139-145 (above), S₁ with piano *tacet*, and S₂ in strings (below), measures 160-163
seems to be a chromaticized version of theme B, with the rising arpeggiation answered by a gradual descent, forming an arch shape. As in P and Tr, the S-zone also features cohesion followed by dissolution. \(S_1\) is first presented in strings only, followed by a rhapsodic solo piano echo of the entire theme that leads to \(S_2\) (measure 160), which similarly is exchanged antiphonally between strings and piano. The two themes are presented simultaneously with \(S_1\) in piano and \(S_2\) in the strings, finally culminating in a triumphant, \textit{largamente}, homophonic presentation of \(S_1\) at measure 181. The theme ascends in pitch, seeming to lead to a climax, but is harshly interrupted by a brand new theme that is entirely different in character from anything we have heard before (Example 3.4). It is not derived from A or B, and is extraneous to the thematic makeup of sonata form as enacted here. It sounds like an ungraceful intrusion on the expected S-zone climax, marked \textit{fff} and \textit{molto pesante}, presented in unison in all five instruments. Hereafter this theme is referred to as INT (connoting both interruption and intrusion).

The INT theme will rear its oppressive, ugly head throughout all three movements of the composition, eventually becoming the subject of the Finale’s Theme and Variations construction. This theme features a stepwise ascending contour in contrast to the descents characteristic of motive A, theme B, \(S_1\), and \(S_2\).\(^9\) It is tonally ambiguous due to the D-major triads accompanying it, but the melody itself indicates F\# minor. The key is a whole step up from the beginning of the S-zone, recalling the MC, but also a tritone away from the initial key of C minor, emphasizing tonal distance as well as melodic contrast. The effect is one of extreme thematic dissonance between this and all of the surrounding musical material, and immediately leads us to wonder what its fundamental purpose—structural and expressive—is in this work. INT sounds three

\(^9\) It may be possible to interpret this theme as an elaborated mirror inversion of motive A. While this possible derivation is not invalid, the effect of INT in its first appearance is wholly opposite to the general downward trajectory of each motto/theme presented thus far, and especially to the character of themes presented in the S-zone.
Example 3.4: I, measures 184-187, climax of S₁ and subsequent INT in measure 186 (boxed)

times and is abruptly cut off at measure 191, where the piano descends in octaves, recalling the end of the transition to the MC. The scalar pattern walks down to E, eliding with the start of the development.

The development section begins in the parallel mode of E minor (measure 199) and features all of the preceding thematic material, including the extended variant on motive A that has been instrumental in establishing formal boundaries, wending through several different key areas. The unison INT theme returns forcefully in measure 277 after a direct lead-in marked stringendo poco più mosso, this time in F minor with D₈-major accompaniment. The half-step descent from INT’s first appearance in F♯ minor counterbalances the chromatic ascent of C to C♯
minor between P and the climax of Tr, which served to tonally prepare the S-zone in E major. The descent here also paves the way for a formal division, preparing the recapitulation by functioning as the subdominant of the original tonic. In keeping with the compositional trend of textural cohesiveness leading to formal divisions, the reenergized INT theme functions as the retransition, effectively melting into motive A for the tonal and thematic return. When INT first appeared in measure 186, its repetitions were at successively higher pitch levels. At its tutti presentation as the retransition, the repetitions are on a downward trajectory from F-E♭-D-C, creating a motivic parallelism and eliding with the descending tetrachord of motive A for the start of the recapitulation (Example 3.5).

The recapitulation rights the tonal wrongs from the exposition, beginning in C minor, omitting a transition, and featuring S-zone material in E♭ major, adhering to Edward T. Cone’s sonata principle that the recapitulation will bring back the secondary material in a key closer to the tonic. After revisiting most of the thematic material from the exposition, S₂ (measure 310) appears in D♭ major/minor—the third is raised but scale degrees 6 and 7 are lowered. This leads to and is echoed in a quiet C-major/minor statement of P (measure 325), a pre-coda of sorts. One cannot help but notice the inversional symmetry between the exposition’s restatement of P from C minor to C# minor and the S-zone’s gradual ascent from E major to F# minor answered in the recapitulation’s descent from S₁ in E♭ major to S₂ in D♭ major/minor eventually resolving down a half step to C major/minor for the pre-coda. The rising contour of the P theme is maximized at its return, eventually growing to a fortissimo climax (measures 358-361). The ending of the theme is

---

Example 3.5: I, measures 277-287, INT in F minor leading to recap. Motive A boxed, F-E♭-D-C circled in bass
cut short, denying anything that could be interpreted as an ESC, and launches immediately into a
coda (measure 362) that descends registrally and dynamically. The coda expands the descending
minor tetrachord of motive A with its logical conclusion, a descent from G to C. Theme B is
heard in all instruments except the violin, but there is heavy emphasis on A♭ throughout, which
serves to corrupt the shift to a strong C major. The coda’s emphasis on the lowered sixth scale
degree seems especially doleful considering the events just before the climax of the
recapitulation. Measures 351-352, a rhapsodic melody starting on A♭, are sequenced up by half
step to begin on A in measures 355-356. The drive toward heroic structural closure in C major
seems inevitable until the *fortissimo* climax on the descending C-minor tetrachord, reversing the
A♭ to A♭ for the entirety of the coda. The double bass quietly ends the movement, playing motive
A over a sustained C-major triad. While the final sonority is a C-major triad, a common modal
“correction” seen throughout musical history in a minor-mode movement, there remains a sense
of uneasiness at this ending with respect to both modality and thematic design. The harmonic
emphasis on the lowered sixth scale degree throughout the coda, in conjunction with the dynamic
and registral descent, and especially the final melodic statement of a descending minor
tetrachord, makes the feeling of true closure in a rhetorically uplifting C major tenuous at best.
The movement ends quietly, without any attempt at structural contextualization of the INT
theme; consequently, INT still feels like a thematic outlier due to its absence since the
retransition.

In sum, the first movement is paradoxical: the traditionally contrasting zones in the
exposition of a sonata, P, S₁, and S₂, are indeed quite different in terms of expression, character,
and influence, but germinate from the same musical seeds. Motive A is varied slightly and
expanded to become S₁, while theme B is chromatically corrupted to become its counterpart, S₂.
The true compositional opposition comes in the form of INT, which subverts the pitch and contour characteristics of the P and S material with its upward, stepwise motion. Vaughan Williams exploits the similarities between the P and S themes and allows them to dovetail into one another at formal divisions, but only after the ensemble coalesces to present a theme assertively in a unison or homophonic texture. P and S are able to work together and coexist at the end of the movement, and the harmonic idiosyncrasies presented in the exposition are mirrored in the recapitulation, lending the movement a semblance of equilibrium and balance despite the lack of convincing closure. The subversive INT theme does not appear at all in the recapitulation or coda, with the forceful retransition being its last appearance. While the expected compositional elements are handled as we would expect in a sonata form (albeit with lack of an EEC, ESC, or a true sense of narrative closure), the most unexpected, intrusive material is never contextualized, leaving the second movement to pick up where the first leaves off.

The second movement of the Piano Quintet features thematic material derived from the first movement along with an increased presence of INT. The slow movement is a ternary form in Eb major. The movement opens with a motto, presented first in piano and then strings, derived from the first movement’s theme B (Example 3.6). Since it features a descending gesture on the notes Bb-Ab-G, it is inherently tied to motive A as well. The opening four measures are tonally ambiguous, as the implied C minor tonic only appears in second inversion. When the strings repeat the motto, the last note is contextualized with the bass Eb. This root-position tonic harmony is preceded by an added beat in measure 4, allowing for the anticipatory G in the violin over the true dominant, Bb major. After the absence of cadential dominants in the first movement, this moment is heavily marked as Brahmsian German Romantic.
Example 3.6: II, measures 1-5 (above), motto in piano answered by strings, derived from I/49-53 (below)
While the structural downbeat of the movement occurs at the Lento in measure 5, the motto will continue to serve as a source of tonal ambiguity. The movement’s 23-measure cantabile theme is then sounded by the piano (measures 5-27), with strings immediately echoing (measures 30-54). The theme is primarily in E♭ major, passing through G major (reminiscent of the major third relation in movement I) before settling again in E♭. Significantly, the lengthy main theme will consistently return to this melodic gesture throughout the movement and resolve, surprisingly, to various chromatic mediants of E♭ major. The stark chromaticism is jarring after a largely triadic and predictable Romantic theme, and denies our cadential expectations. These harmonic surprises are immediately answered with half-step motion before settling on the “correct” cadence in E♭ (Example 3.7).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Resolution Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Resolves to G major, chromatic shift to G♭ major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Resolves to C major, chromatic shift to B major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160</td>
<td>Resolves to G♭ major, shifts to D major and ascends to E♭ major.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170</td>
<td>Sounds in D major, to close movement on E♭ major.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Example 3.7: Table of motto’s chromatic mediant resolutions

It is important to note that the thematic material in this movement bears striking similarity to two other compositions: the first is Vaughan Williams’s own song “Silent Noon,” which will be discussed later in this chapter; the other is the second movement of Brahms’ Violin Sonata No. 1 in G Major, Op. 78. The piano opens that movement with an E♭-major theme that shares several melodic and harmonic features with Vaughan Williams’s Piano Quintet (Example 3.8).
Example 3.8: II, measures 5-15 *Piano Quintet* (above); Brahms Op. 78/II, 1-9 (below); similar melodic passages bracketed in like colors
The chromatic mediant relationship between the first and second movements of Brahms (G major to Eb major) is reproduced in this movement as well. Perhaps this could be considered a Brahmsian parody, as Vaughan Williams’s teacher, Charles Villiers Stanford, greatly admired Brahms and used several of his works as teaching models with his students.\textsuperscript{11} Stanford’s teaching methods were too conservative for Vaughan Williams, which led to several clashes between them.\textsuperscript{12} By the time of this work’s composition, Vaughan Williams had been away from the RCM for several years and had begun working with folk song. The dichotomy between Germanic influence and an exploration of more personal, English techniques is clearly marked throughout the Piano Quintet, and an overt parody of a work by a mainstay of German romanticism is not out of the question.

Despite the fleeting chromaticism that appears in the A section, the texture and thematic material is generally tranquil and serene. The B section (measures 55-133) upsets this expressive quality immediately. The formal boundary is heralded by a sharp turn to Eb minor and the return of INT, in unison as before, in the strings. This troublesome interjection is met with a rather dramatic, more lyrical theme Y that tries to right the mode shift back to major. The theme is reminiscent of theme B, but has ties to the motto from the opening of this movement (Example 3.9).

\begin{example}
\begin{music}
\begin{Staff}
\verticalSpace{25pt}
\begin{Note}
\pitch{G7} \duration{4}\movingTo \movetoG3\movingTo \movetoC3\movingTo \movetoF7\movingTo \movetoBb3
\end{Note}
\end{Staff}
\end{music}
\end{example}

\textit{Example 3.9: II, measures 58-62, Theme Y in violin}


With the return of INT, the B section of the movement unfolds as a battle between the opening motto, INT, and Y, accompanied by Vaughan Williams’s expressive character markings of *agitato* for a rhythmic diminution of the motto, *appassionato* and *con molto passione* for theme Y, and *minacciando* (threatening) for multiple appearances of INT (measures 95 and 128). Dramatically, one can readily envision a power struggle between the menacing INT chasing a frantic motto based on theme B and distressed theme Y. The section explores various keys, and starkly contrasts unison sonorities with polyphony. A dramatic, chromatic, unison scream in the strings (measure 131) abruptly brings the return of A’. While the tumultuous tug of war between themes seems to be forgotten, tonal instability continues undaunted, as A’ exploits the chromatic mediant shift by cadencing in G♭ major (measure 160). This time, instead of descending a half step as before, the cadence is reattempted in D major and resolves upwards to E♭ major.

The coda (measures 165-178) presents the entire movement in microcosm, similar to its function in the first movement. Theme Y returns in F♯ minor (*teneramente, con sordino*) but is not permitted to complete its phrase. This key area is one closely associated with INT, the other being E♭ minor, and recalls the second movement’s B section *agitato* in measure 65 and the *poco animando* in measure 82. The theme’s incompleteness, coupled with its harmonization in INT’s key, weakens its rhetorical force in two dimensions. Truncated Y deceptively resolves to D major, in a repeat of the harmonic motion heard in measure 161. The melody dovetails into the motto in the piano, whose resolution is literally interrupted and suspended by one last, *marcato* INT entrance in viola and cello. The tail of this particularly brash INT drops a half step to end back in E♭ major (for once, it *can* get along with other themes), with the double bass once again descending in a scalar pattern over a sustained tonic triad. Just as in the first movement, resolution is unattained. In movement I, the formal and narrative closure was unconvincing.
Here, the ending is even less stable in that there is no standard cadential motion—authentic or plagal. After intimidating and overpowering the opening motive and romantic theme Y, the still-uncontextualized INT theme is the last melodic idea that sounds, a marcato, forzando utterance over a pianissimo triadic texture.

The Piano Quintet’s second movement resurrects and gives heightened prominence to the previously abandoned INT theme from movement I. INT appears as a formal outlier there, a marked, unnecessary extra theme in the formal context of a sonata, and in opposition to the themes and motives comprising P, Tr, S, and C. The recapitulation of the movement never revisits the theme (whose last appearance was sounded as the forceful retransition), hence failing to reconcile it formally or compositionally. There is a through-line to movement II, which continues the tonal story of its predecessor—primarily E♭ major and C minor with unprepared chromatic mediant shifts—along with its thematic content, as the motto is a derivative of theme B and theme Y’s expressive quality is romantic and Brahmsian. Vaughan Williams appears to use the ternary form as a battleground between the motto, theme Y, and INT. Through specific expression markings, the three melodic agents may be interpreted in anthropomorphic terms, with INT musically representing an antagonizing, bullish threat chasing the anguished, Romantic themes with their descending contours. INT becomes less of an “interruption” and more of an “intimidator” throughout the B section. It is the last true theme standing at the end of the movement, interrupting the A section material on a forzando, marcato entrance and giving way to a scalar descent, but it acquiesces slightly by resolving to the overarching tonal center of E♭.

With the start of the finale, the preexisting value system, in which INT is the antagonistic foil to its musical surroundings, will be upended.
The third and final movement, a highly modified theme and variations, has as its main theme what by now is a very familiar melody: the INT theme that fought for prominence in movements I and II. It maintains its melodic shape from movement II (lacking the dramatic upward leap at the end from movement I), and is still played by unison strings, but now is *piano molto legato*, expands to five measures, and spans a major sixth. The movement begins in a definitive C major with no lowered scale degrees, in stark contrast to the previous movements that were in C minor and E♭ major (Example 3.10).

![Example 3.10: III, measures 1-5, INT as primary theme in unison strings](image)

The quality of this transformed INT is remarkable. It is no longer aggressive and forceful, but pastoral and serene, and breathes Britain rather than Germany. Its folk-song quality and unison presentation harkens back to the S-theme of movement I, the first appearance of an English idiom, and initially sheds the Germanic piano accompaniment in lieu of an all-string presentation à la English viol consorts. After the first five measures in unison, the piano echoes with triadic, diatonic harmonies, with the exception of an A-major chord harmonizing the second beat of measure 9. After this, the strings play the six-measure continuation of the theme, again in unison,
establishing a binary form construction typical of a theme and variations movement. The peak of the theme is the lowered seventh scale degree, a modal chromatic inflection (Example 3.11). The piano echoes with a harmonized version as before, with chromatic inflection on D major.

Example 3.11: mm. 11-16, B Section of Theme with lowered ^7

(measure 18.1) and B♭ major (measure 17.3, measure 20.3). After the initial statement of the binary form theme, the variations begin.

It is important to note that Vaughan Williams does not actually call this movement “Theme and Variations,” but rather, “Fantasia (quasi variazioni).” The title implies that the music we are about to hear will mostly be loosely structured and unpredictable, with an underpinning of repetition or thematic grounding. In practice, the composer delivers the opposite: a very clear statement of a simply harmonized theme, followed by a textural variation after a fermata over a double bar.

Example 3.12 presents a formal outline of the movement. Variation 1 features a tonal diversion to E major (measure 36), a chromatic mediant relationship from the opening of the movement in keeping with much of the harmonic motion throughout the Quintet.
### A-Section (Theme and Variations)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>mm. 1-22</th>
<th>mm. 23-40</th>
<th>mm. 41-46</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>INT-Theme:</strong> (\text{</td>
<td></td>
<td>A:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C major</td>
<td>C major</td>
<td>A major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Senza espressione</em>; austere; English folk music</td>
<td><em>Leggiero, grazioso</em>; pastoral (nymphs and shepherds)</td>
<td>9/8 tempo; <em>cantabile</em>; lilting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### B-Section (Fantasia+Variations)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>mm. 47-58</th>
<th>mm. 59-67</th>
<th>mm. 67-97</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>pp cantabile</em>, appearance of arpeggiated piano accompaniment, attempt to finish B-section of INT-theme but consistently thwarted, becomes Fantasia theme</td>
<td>Fantasia-Var 1, theme passed between all instruments; <em>cantabile</em> arpeggiated accompaniment flourish in piano, <em>pp</em></td>
<td>Fantasia-Var 2 Piano begins <em>ff appassionato</em>, upward-striving sequences gain energy to each new statement of theme, presented in violin over INT in cel, dbl bass, pno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C# - A major</td>
<td>As major (\rightarrow) C major</td>
<td>E(^\flat) minor (\rightarrow) A major (\rightarrow) G(^#) major (\rightarrow) E minor (\rightarrow) &quot;C&quot; minor (\rightarrow) G minor (\rightarrow) B major (\rightarrow) E minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dreamlike, rhapsodic; wistful</td>
<td>Dreamlike, rhapsodic; wistful</td>
<td>Sturm und Drang, intense, dramatic, chaotic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### A’-Section (Return to Theme and Variations)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>mm. 98-113</th>
<th>mm. 114-135</th>
<th>mm. 136-166</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>INT-Variation 3</strong>, two-measure increments passed from voice-to-voice, staccato triplet accompaniment, <em>molt allegro, pp</em></td>
<td><strong>INT-Variation 4</strong>, Embellished, triadically-harmonized theme in piano, <em>pizz</em> accompaniment, <em>pp</em> chromatic “magic fire” continuations (arco saltando)</td>
<td><strong>INT-Variation 5</strong>, Stripped down theme, only characteristic intervals, chorale texture, cel/dbl bass lead into coda with end of theme’s B-section including lowered (^#6) and (^#7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passes through OCT I collection (A (\rightarrow) E)</td>
<td>C major</td>
<td>C major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spritely; energetic; bouyant</td>
<td>Brilliant, joyous, celebratory</td>
<td>Languorous, placid</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Coda

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>mm. 167-190</th>
<th>mm. 191-226</th>
<th>mm. 227-244</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Descent in mm. 165-166 extended to scalar descent in all voices, ends up chromatically altered (m. 182), theme X returns</td>
<td><em>animando poco a poco</em>, theme X (largamente) gains prominence and energy, begins to invert into an upward-striving theme, increased texture and dynamics, <em>animando sempre</em>, homophonic exclamation leads of triumphant theme</td>
<td>Registral peak in strings, sustained C-major triad; immediate descent from <em>fff to pp</em>; Piano attempts one last statement of main theme, is interrupted in m. 232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C major (\rightarrow) C(^#) major</td>
<td>E(^\flat) major (\rightarrow) D(^#) major</td>
<td>C major (no (^#6) or (^#7))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energetic, triumphant</td>
<td>Victory followed by immediate deflation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Example 3.12: Form Chart of Movement II**
In the midst of that chromatic disruption, the end of the theme is disrupted as well in measure 38, changing direction and contour (Example 3.13).

Example 3.13: mm. 36-39, showing altered end of theme

The end of Variation 2 (measures 41-46), markedly in A major (the site of the first chromatic harmonization of the theme), brings the title of the movement to the fore. The variation dovetails into the descending fantasia theme in measure 47 and is clearly marked by the composer through dramatic changes in texture, key, and thematic treatment.

The fantasia proper begins in C# major in measure 47, as the previously-uncontextualized material presented in cello and bass in measure 38 is featured and developed. Now that this melodic idea is given greater hierarchical status, it becomes clear that the contrasting fantasia theme is based on the inversion of INT.

The tonal center for the beginning of the fantasia recalls the first movement, where C# minor was an unexpected tonal destination for the return of P material (compare mvmt. I, measures 102ff.). Now presented in the major mode, still a half step up from the C-major tonic, it is the site of an unexpected formal diversion. In contrast to the movement’s unison first theme (based on INT), all the instruments treat the fantasia idea polyphonically. There are two variations of the fantasia theme: the first is straightforward in A♭ major (measure 59), but the second begins in a dramatic E♭ minor (measure 67) with a decidedly Sturm und Drang quality to
it. After a solo piano statement, the strings join in E minor (notably up a half-step). After traversing through various keys, the violin plays the fantasia theme while the low strings and piano bring back the ff, marcato version of INT we are familiar with from the first two movements (measure 93). Stacking the two competing motives in this fashion effectively brings the end to the fantasia, with the opening thematic material (the transformed INT) emerging as the victor.

It is of note that the third movement exhibits a transvaluation of which themes function as “order” and “transgression.” INT was previously the interrupter with ascending contour that had to be reckoned with in earlier movements, whereas now it is the fantasia theme’s descending, romantic quality that takes on the role of “intruder.” After all of this tumult, at measure 98 we return to the initial variations idea back in A major, as if the fantasia were an accidental tangent. The return gives the “Fantasia (quasi variazioni)” a large ternary form, with each large section being comprised of distinct themes and two smaller variations.

The return of A’ and the stepwise theme beginning measure 98 launches the movement into the most adventurous tonal territory for the entire Quintet. We hear the theme presented in a whirlwind of different, distantly related keys, eventually returning to C for the beginning of variation 4 in measure 114. This spritely fourth variation begins initially in the piano, with the theme ornamented and diatonically harmonized for 11 measures until the shift into a descending chromatic scale and accompaniment reminiscent of Wagner’s “Magic Fire” Leitmotif from Die

---

13 A narrative term initially introduced by Liszka in The Semiotic of Myth, Byron Almén describes its meaning thus: “By transvaluation, Liszka refers to the following semiotic translation process: a hierarchy set up within a system of signs is subjected to change over time; this change, filtered through an observer’s design or purpose, is interpreted as being isomorphic to a change applied to a cultural hierarchy (whether social or psychological). Thus, narrative tracks the effect of transgressive shifts or conflicts on a prevailing cultural system, as inflected by that which is important to the observer…A piece’s initial musical events, configured in various hierarchical relationships, establish a network of cultural values, and the asymmetries of the initial condition and/or any subsequent changes in these relationships place these values in conflict, leading to resolution in a manner significant to the culturally informed listener…Narrative organization tracks the changes of these markedness and rank relations over a temporal span.” See Byron Almén, A Theory of Musical Narrative (Indiana: Indiana University Press, 2008), 40-41.
Walküre. The rhythmic impulse comes to a halt in measure 136 as the final variation before the coda occurs. In it, the theme is reduced to a few characteristic intervals and recalls its original ambitus (Example 3.14).

![Molto moderato \( \text{\(j=72\)} \)]

Example 3.14: III, measures 136-139, beginning of variation 5 and thematic skeleton

At the end of this final variation beginning measure 165, where we might expect a definitive cadence in C major before the coda, the cello and double bass play a descending scalar pattern containing B\(b\) and A\(b\). The lowered seventh recalls the primary theme of this movement, while the addition of A\(b\) recalls the descending minor tetrachord of motive A from the very opening of the Quintet.
The coda begins in measure 167 with all voices sharing a descending scalar pattern, a technique Vaughan Williams used at formal boundaries and codas in the previous two movements as well. As the scale is chromaticized, the fantasia motive returns (measures 183ff.), and its plunging contour is eventually reversed into a heroic, ascending gesture (measure 206). The dramatic ascent provides a noticeable contrast to almost every main theme encountered in the work, which all share a downward trajectory, with the exception of INT. This registral ascent culminates in a unison ff marcato presentation of the climactic heroic idea (measure 216), which was the dynamic/articulation marking for our introduction to the INT theme in movement I. This exclamation occurs in D♭ major (!) which resolves outward to C major for the last presentation of the theme, echoing the half-step shifts characteristic of the earlier movements.

With the heroic inversion of INT in measure 216, the third movement’s thematic material, sounded in unison, proceeds as other unison utterances have throughout: it reaches a climactic moment when we hear the piano proudly proclaiming the harmonized theme, but this final statement is incomplete (Example 3.15). The phrase should conclude with D-C as in measure 2, but D-C is supplanted by F-E, leading to climactic and thematic denial. The texture quickly dissolves and dissipates in the final measures of the finale, as all the strings leap down four octaves while the piano moves quietly to the double bar in a descending scalar pattern. All instruments sustain a quiet C-major triad at the piece’s end, and the possibility of formal closure is denied. The indefatigably aggressive nature of INT throughout the first two movements and its subsequent transformation into a benevolent, English folk tune set it up as an agent of structural closure; but, within the context of this movement in relation to the work as a whole, the melodic incompleteness of INT as the final gesture of this piece defeats any attempt at formal and
thematic closure. Consequently, the structural narrative may be construed as “incompletion-as-defeat.”

Several broad patterns emerge from the preceding analysis of Vaughan Williams’s Piano Quintet in C Minor. There is a tonal emphasis on unexpected chromatic mediants or half-step motion across large sections or at final cadences. The thematic material throughout the entirety of the work can all be traced back to motives A and B from the very opening of movement I, with the clear exception of the INT theme. There is a dichotomy between unison textures and their harmonizations as well as thematic unity and homophony versus polyphonic or antiphonal thematic treatment across the ensemble. We are rarely given formal/narrative closure. The first movement lacks a clear EEC or ESC, and it concludes in modally ambivalent fashion; the second movement ends with the INT intruding on the final statement of the motto; and the finale’s climax coincides with an incomplete presentation of the theme in the coda of movement III. Many of the same chromatic tonal areas are explored throughout the work. Lastly, there is an obvious clash between the yearning Romantic-style themes and the stepwise, seemingly out-of-place INT theme, which is eventually groomed to become the pastoral theme of the final movement. Vaughan Williams’s story of INT and its eventual emergence as thematic victor establishes a value system for the composer. At first, it appeared that the first movement’s P and S zones set up the opposition between continental- and English folk-inspired themes. After closer examination, it was shown that both S themes were actually derived from the same Germanic roots. There was no true thematic opposition presented in the exposition. It was the seemingly extraneous INT theme that was unique and set apart from the surrounding musical material, representing the “other.”
Example 3.15: III, measures 1-2 (above), and 226-244 (below), demonstrating climactic and thematic denial.
Its dogged perseverance throughout the second movement and subsequent celebrated status as the basis for a variation set in the end represents a transvaluation between order (continental) and transgression (Englishness), to borrow from Byron Almén’s terminology. The outsider upends the prevailing order, setting up an ironic comedy wherein there is a “strong emphasis on the initial hierarchy, with the transgressive elements effecting a transvaluation only after great difficulty, or as if out of the blue.”  

We typically expect a cyclic sonata to feature a transformative function of the returning material, but this work does not conform to that expectation. Instead, it remains categorically unchanged. It is given an expressive facelift by the start of the third movement, but does no work in reconciling opposing themes and influences; it merely stomps them into submission until they fade away. This narrative suggests that Vaughan Williams had not yet figured out how to make Germanic and English influences work together and coexist successfully. By exploring other projects Vaughan Williams was working on at this stage of his career, I will show how the compositional trends presented here signify an overarching stylistic and expressive narrative of balance and stillness as he sought to develop his unique compositional voice.

Vaughan Williams’s best-known works from the first decade of the twentieth century are his art songs and A Sea Symphony. While composing the Piano Quintet, he was simultaneously working on the The House of Life (1904), settings of six sonnets by Dante Gabriel Rossetti (1828-1882) for baritone and piano. “Silent Noon,” the second in the cycle, shares thematic material with the second movement of the Quintet. Its opening measures are reproduced in Example 3.16. All poems chosen for The House of Life are found in the first section of Rossetti’s
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15 Conway, liner notes.
mammoth sequence of 102 sonnets of the same name published in 1881, under the subheading “Youth and Change.” The first part of the collection primarily speaks to youthful, exuberant love and relationships. Vaughan Williams’s songs set the poems in almost chronological order (numbers 4, 19, 9, 22, 48, 59), and generally follow a path of optimism to despair. The text for “Silent Noon” is reproduced in Example 3.17.

Example 3.16: “Silent Noon,” measures 1-6 and its similarity to the motto of mvmt II.

Your hands lie open in the long fresh grass,—
The finger-points look through like rosy blooms:
Your eyes smile peace. The pasture gleams and glooms
'Neath billowing skies that scatter and amass.
All round our nest, far as the eye can pass,
Are golden kingcup fields with silver edge
Where the cow-parsley skirts the hawthorn-hedge.
'Tis visible silence, still as the hour-glass.

Deep in the sun-searched growths the dragon-fly
Hangs like a blue thread loosened from the sky:—
So this wing'd hour is dropt to us from above.
Oh! clasp we to our hearts, for deathless dower,
This close-companioned inarticulate hour
When twofold silence was the song of love.

Example 3.17: Text of “Silent Noon,” Dante Gabriel Rossetti
The poet was born in London, the son of two Italian émigrés. Rossetti’s poem is a Petrarchan sonnet, for which he has altered the traditional rhyme scheme of the poetic form. While there is often more flexibility in the rhyme scheme of the sestet than the octave, the standard rhyme scheme is as follows: a b b a a b b a c d e c d e. Rossetti’s adds new rhymes to the octet and completely alters the sestet, resulting in a b b a a c c a d d e f f e. The general idea of the octet introducing a problem that the sestet subsequently addresses is also upended here: the first tercet in the second part really belongs to the octet’s description of “you” and the pasture, leaving the final tercet to address the problem of remembering this quiet moment. There clearly is a strong debt paid to this distinctly Italian art form, but the model has been, perhaps, co-opted and slightly corrupted, leaving the conventional intent of “the sonnet” generally unfulfilled.

The poem concerns itself with a number of themes, but the main image presented is that of a quiet moment wherein two people observe “visible silence.” She (presumably) is lying in a field while clouds scatter overhead. But all around them is the stillness of nature, first described in the surrounding foliage, but then focused on the blue dragonfly. Typically these insects are constantly moving, zipping from plant to plant, but this one hangs motionless while still in flight, like a thread dangled from above, and the poetic subjects marvel at the silence and stillness of their surroundings.

When considered in relation to Rossetti’s poem, many examples of “stillness” become apparent in the Piano Quintet: the static nature of the revisited tonal centers in all three movements; thematic material returning unchanged and sometimes in fuller force despite the interruptions and battles for supremacy; lack of triumphant resolution, but rather a gradual fading away into nothingness; balancing unexpected tonal shifts in one direction by mirroring them later in the piece; and of course, all movements ending in similar manner. The use of second
movement material in *The House of Life* demonstrates a parallel to other projects on the composer’s docket at the time, but both the song cycle and Piano Quintet also coincide with Vaughan Williams’s burgeoning interest in English folk song.

The composer penned a letter to Lucy Broadwood, one of the founders of the English Folk-Song Society and pioneering collector of folk songs, in 1902. In it, he asks for her assistance with his understanding of Scottish folk songs:

Dear Miss Broadwood,

Can you help me on the subject of Scottish songs? I want to say a few words in the course of a lecture on Folksongs, on the subject of Scottish songs - There won’t be time to say much on the subject - but I have chosen 3 points

(i) The difference if any between gaelic or highland (are they the same?) and lowland songs. Is there any sharp dividing line between these? What is a characteristic specimen of each kind – I’ve spent 3 days in the museum and found nothing to help me.

(ii) The pentatonic scale. What is the best example of a pentatonic tune? (*not* a modern imitation like ‘Ye banks and Braes’)

(iii) The modulation (say) from G minor to F. [sic] and back. I am pretty well set up on this subject and have chosen ‘Adew Dundie’ (out of the Skene M.S.) as my example.

I shall be very grateful if you will help me.

Yrs very truly

R. Vaughan Williams

P.S. I wish you would do for the Scottish songs what you have done for the English – these Malcolm Lawsons and people make me ill!

This letter informs us that Vaughan Williams was, by this time, quite interested in the collecting of folk songs and educating others about their inner workings and history. Additionally, he demonstrates interest in pentatonic scales (something that will be a hallmark of his), unexpected

---


17 Ibid, 42.
tonal shifts (down a whole step in this case), and retaining the purity of the folk song as an art form rather than making it more appealing to Edwardian tastes.

The composer is referring to a series of six talks given in Bournemouth, England, at the Pokesdown Science, Art, and Technical School from October to December of 1902. While the transcripts of these lectures do not survive, there are newspaper clippings that record some of what the composer said and the audience reaction in increasing detail. The fourth lecture is where he spoke of “Adew Dundee” (elsewhere, “Adieu, Dundie”), a Scottish folk song found in the Skene manuscript, which contains several popular tunes probably written down in the early 1600s. One clipping states, “Dr. Williams (the lecturer) introduced Miss Broadwood, who was heartily received. She entered thoroughly into the spirit of the songs and a prominent feature, in addition to her effective vocalisation, was Dr. Vaughan Williams’s accompaniments, which were often improvised and played with exquisite harmony and feeling.” We can infer from this that Lucy Broadwood sang “the text” to “Adew, Dundee,” which is an untexted folk tune as far as we know. William Dauney, who examined the Skene manuscript and published a book titled Ancient Scottish Melodies in 1838, writes, “The recovery of the old words would be better than all [the current ones that are sung]; but that is now hopeless, and we know of no historical event or tradition connected with Dundee on which they were likely to have been founded.” Dauney is referring to text that was retroactively applied to this tune and that he considers inferior. The main text in songbooks, by Charles Neaves, is found in Example 3.18.

---

There is a significant overlap of meaning between this poem and Rossetti’s “Silent Noon.” The ideas of nature reflecting the status of the relationship between two people and the comparison of stillness (when in love) and tumult (when parted) are very much on display in this retrospective text. In verse two, the presumably youthful man is in love and nature responds accordingly. After the death of the relationship, the seas and winds reflect the turmoil as he leaves his beloved and his home. These two texts point to awareness by the composer of his youth and the youthful love he shared with his wife Adeline, whom he wed in 1897. The songs Vaughan Williams had set up to this point were all aligned with themes of nature and youthful love. Strikingly, the theme from the third movement of the Quintet is also representative of his love for Adeline, as he reused the theme in his 1954 Violin Sonata in A Minor, written shortly after moving to Hanover Terrace following her death.

1. Adieu, Dundee, from Mary parted,
Here nae mair my lot may be.
Wha can bear when broken hearted,
Scenes that peak o' joys gone by.
A' things ance were sweet and smiling
In the light o' Mary's e'e,
Fairest seemings maist beguiling
Love, adieu! Adieu, Dundee.

2. Like yon water softly gliding,
When the wind are laid to sleep
Such my life, when I confiding
Gave to her my heart to keep.
Like yon water widly rushing
When the northwind stirs the sea,
Such a change my heart now's crushing,
Love, adieu! Adieu, Dundee.

Example 3.18: Lord Charles Neaves’ lyrics to “Adieu, Dundee”
In that composition, the theme receives a much more standardized Theme and Variation treatment than in the Piano Quintet. Perhaps Vaughan Williams, writing in the same instrumentation as Schubert’s famous “Trout” Quintet, wanted to shy away from a traditional variations movement to avoid the inevitable comparison.22

“Adew, Dundee” also spoke to Vaughan Williams because of what he refers to as a “modulation (say) from G minor to F. [sic] and back.” Dauney’s book clarifies this as meaning the impression of a given key on the ear, and can be thought of as the present day notions of “(extended) tonicization” or “modulation,” where the former passes through a key temporarily and the latter confirms it with a cadence.23 The folk-tune modulation achieves its descent of a whole step due to the use of lowered scale degrees 6 and 7 throughout, and takes advantage of the flatted 7 to tonicize it briefly. See Example 3.19 for the score to “Adieu, Dundee!”

The “modulation” that so intrigued Vaughan Williams can be seen in the third system, measures 21-24, where the regularly lowered scale degree 7 from the “E minor” section is granted temporary tonic status. After those four measures, “E minor” returns, keeping the seventh scale degree lowered, but raising the sixth, effectively creating an E-dorian pitch collection.24

In this light, the melodic characteristics in the Piano Quintet, especially in the last movement, come into focus. The second part of the theme from movement III featured a subtonic followed by a diatonic 6 (measure 20, derived from measure 14 in Example 3.11).

22 A closer comparison could be made to the Piano Quintet, Op. 87 (1802) by Johann Nepomuk Hummel, whose composition predates the Schubert by 17 years and aided in popularizing the genre. Hummel’s composition features 3 flats in the key signature, but opens in a dark E@ minor, descending by half–step to D major for the Tr, and F# minor/A major for the S-zone. Surprise tonal shifts by minor second pervade the first movement as well. Notwithstanding these correspondences, there is no evidence that Vaughan Williams knew the Hummel.


24 Naturally, the shift to D major may also be construed in relation to the consistent use of the minor (modal) dominant B minor, as its relative major.
Example 3.19: “Adieu, Dundee” with text by Charles Neaves

The sudden, unprepared tonal shifts could also be seen as a corruption of the modulatory techniques he was discovering in English folk tunes, a genre he would champion and utilize throughout his compositional life.

The final lecture, titled “The Importance of Folk Song,” was extensively chronicled in the newspapers. Vaughan Williams asserted that all great composers had been fond of and used folk
songs frequently, and it was especially the case during his lifetime due to the rise of nationalism—a nation’s identity and its art forms growing and expanding together. He then turned to English music, wondering when his country’s musical renaissance would occur (by this time of course, the seeds of the English Musical Renaissance had been planted and were beginning to flourish). He goes on to add:

A very good test of any composer’s fitness to represent his country, proceeded the lecturer, was the way in which he harmonised the national tunes of his own country. Folk-songs, of course, we originally sung [sic] without any harmony at all – that was, just the melody alone without any accompaniment. But to their ears whose tunes did most strongly suggest appropriate harmonies and figures with which they should be accompanied; they felt at once when a tune was harmonised in the right way or the wrong way, suitably or unsuitably, well or badly. The accompanying and harmonisation of tunes was a task worthy of the greatest musicians, as great skill, great sense of beauty and great inventive power were necessary, but that was not enough. Beethoven had all those, yet his arrangements of Scottish songs were by no means successful, for the musician, great though he might be, must also be in complete sympathy with the national spirit.  

This quotation effectively acts as a compositional mission statement for Vaughan Williams, and it brings several of his compositional techniques in the Piano Quintet to the fore. Textual allusions to youth and love, poetically represented by stillness in nature, are musically reflected in the unchanging nature of much of the thematic and tonal characteristics of the work. The INT theme, in contrast, with its interruptive nature, differing melodic contour, and “otherness,” is eventually recontextualized to become a representative of the composer’s burgeoning interest in English music. Much of the thematic material in the Quintet is grandiose and sweeping in nature, prompting associations with Brahms and the German romantics. The lush textures are generally treated contrapuntally throughout. When they are presented tutti and in a homophonic texture, this often signals a formal division or impending collapse. The INT theme is largely stepwise with an ascending contour, sharing more in common with a simple

English folk tune than anything seen in continental orchestral and chamber music of the nineteenth or twentieth centuries. Each time it appears, it sounds in unison; and, narratively, the INT theme consistently sounds like a threat to the majestic themes and textures that permeate movements I and II. Taking Vaughan Williams’s folk-song lectures into consideration, it reveals another dimension. Borrowing scales, modulation techniques, and melodic characteristics from folk song represents an obvious technique relating to Englishness; hence the INT theme is actually set off as a nationalist underdog in an overwhelming, tumultuous sea of German romanticism. As the movements progress, INT appears more often, but always in a unison presentation. By the final movement, INT is given the opportunity to take center stage as the embodiment of the burgeoning English musical awakening, and Vaughan Williams asserts himself as a “great composer” by his own definition: taking a simple, unison folk tune and harmonizing it with a “great sense of beauty and inventive power,” which is likely from where the unexpected chromatically altered triads such as A major and D major arose. In this early work, Vaughan Williams begins to address a problem that most English composers during the English Musical Renaissance faced: how to create inherently English music and minimize the continental influence pervading classrooms and concert halls. The emergence of INT as a beautifully harmonized “victor” demonstrates his admiration for the songs and musical trends of his home country, and further explains the reasoning behind this exaltation of thematic otherness in what, narratively speaking, is his ironic comedy.

By exploring Vaughan Williams’s other musical and professional endeavors while composing the Piano Quintet, the music signifies more than a gradual acceptance of the INT theme and a shift from C minor to C major. The simultaneous work on “Silent Noon” from The House of Life points to suspended time, youthful love, and admiration of surrounding natural
beauty. The composer’s revival of his newly composed “folk tune” from movement III as the basis of his Violin Sonata’s finale after Adeline’s death connects his youth and admiration for folk music to his old age and her memory. Perhaps he was haunted by the quintessentially English theme, something dear to his heart, and wanted to give it a proper theme and variations treatment. The Bournemouth lectures clearly outline his desire for a resurgence of national music, his respect for folk music, and how great composers should use it; the tonal/scalar intricacies therein would certainly influence his trademark modal style. All of these compositional strands are woven into the thematic, tonal, and textural characteristics of this early work. In it, he creates a safe space for Englishness amidst the tumultuous world of German romanticism.

* * * * *

**Thematic Transformation and Narrative Success in *Phantasy Quintet***

Stanford wanted me to go to Italy and hear opera at the Scala. He thought I was too Teuton already…but I disregarded his advice and went to Berlin. My reason for this choice, I believe, was the extraordinary one that Berlin was the only town at that time where they performed the *Ring* without cuts!26

– Ralph Vaughan Williams

Ralph Vaughan Williams counted Wagner among the great composers who were important to him and spent much time in Germany throughout his life. He visited Berlin, Munich, and Bayreuth, and remained deeply influenced by the work of the German romantics while simultaneously forging a distinctly English musical path and contributing directly to the

---

mission of the English Musical Renaissance. The Phantasy Quintet, composed in 1912 just two years after the Fantasia on a Theme by Thomas Tallis, presents an interesting paradox: a work composed for one of the great proponents of the English Musical Renaissance in the style of Tudor and Baroque English compositions, but one that features both English and continental compositional techniques as demonstrated in the Piano Quintet. Despite the almost decade-long span between the Piano Quintet and the Phantasy Quintet, Vaughan Williams is seen still juxtaposing English themes, modes, and textures with the Germanic chromaticism and developing variation that pervaded all of nineteenth-century music and especially his education with Stanford.

As in the analysis of the Piano Quintet, I will show how this contrast of styles impacts the teleological unfolding of the composition, particularly with regard to folk-inspired themes. Additionally, I identify a specific intertextual relationship with Wagner in order to elucidate a narrative of successful transformation and synthesis, as opposed to the two incompatible narratives of the earlier work.

Vaughan Williams composed the Phantasy Quintet to fulfill W.W. Cobbett’s Phantasy Commission in 1912. Cobbett’s role in the English Musical Renaissance was discussed in Chapter One, along with his Phantasy Competition/Commission. As we saw in Chapter One, the competition was established to augment the English chamber music repertoire and revive what Cobbett considered to be the last distinctly English genre: the viol fantasies of Henry Purcell. The commission had some specific constraints: all voices should carry equal importance, there was to be a recurring theme, and it should be under twelve minutes in length, with the possibility
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of several movements played *attacca*. According to Cobbett, Vaughan Williams’s composition set the standard by which all future Phantasys should be judged.\(^{28}\)

The Quintet contains a great deal more than these compositional specifications. Together, the four *attacca* movements—Prelude, Scherzo, alla Sarabanda, and Burlesca—weave a multivalent narrative hinging on several binary oppositions. The broad structural objective of the Quintet is to shift from a tonal emphasis on F major to that of D major, emphasizing especially the displacement of F by F\(^\#\). The ensuing journey is full of twists and turns, victory, defeat, comedy, and calamity. The long journey of transformation is paralleled in Parsifal’s quest for redemption and the Holy Grail in Wagner’s final opera, which is quoted several times throughout the Phantasy Quintet.

A quote from Cosima Wagner can help set the stage for Vaughan Williams’s ambitious, multi-dimensional narrative. In the opening measures of the first movement, Vaughan Williams presents a compositional “crisis” of two opposed ideas that will recur throughout his composition. According to her diaries, her husband made a comment to her regarding the opening measures of *Parsifal*: “…what he wrote down in the Prelude contains all he needs, and it all unfolds like a flower from its bud.”\(^{29}\) Vaughan Williams does something similar here, using the first thirteen measures of his Prelude to establish, in effect, a *Grundgestalt* for the entire work. It opens simply with a solo viola I line, hereafter referred to as theme X (Example 3.20a). The opening measures resemble the beginning of *Parsifal*, a melody uttered by English horn, clarinets, bassoons, violins, and cellos (notably not the violas). This Leitmotif, called the “Love

---


Feast” or “Communion” motive by Hans von Wolzogen and later musicologists, is the thematic basis of the opera, and shown in Example 3.20b.\textsuperscript{30} By excluding the first note of Wagner’s opera, there is an at-pitch quote of part of the Leitmotif. The contour of the Parsifal excerpt is also bounded by one octave before changing direction, has similar rhythmic features, and shares a pentatonic quality until reaching the leading tone of G in measure 2. There is one chromatic alteration in Wagner’s theme: a D♭, which is a tritone away from the key of A♭. As previously mentioned, D major is the tonal goal of Vaughan Williams’s piece, and while the Prelude of the Phantasy Quintet is not in the key of A♭, this key area and its relative minor will be explored several times over the course of the four movements. Cosima wrote that according to Wagner, “The D major modulation is for him like the spreading of the tender revelation across the whole world.”\textsuperscript{31} There is a strong Germanic tradition of using D major to imply redemption and transfiguration—Mozart’s Requiem, Beethoven’s Symphony No. 9, Schoenberg’s Verklärte Nacht, and even Schubert’s deliberate refusal of triumphant D major in the last chord of his

\begin{figure}
\centering
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\caption{Example 3.20a: I, measures 1-9, solo viola theme X}
\end{figure}

\textsuperscript{30} Hans von Wolzogen, A Key to Parsifal (London: Chappell and Co, 1889), 16.
String Quartet No. 14, “Death and the Maiden”—and both Wagner and Vaughan Williams would have been aware of this.\textsuperscript{32}

The Quintet’s arch-shaped, C-E\textsubscript{b}-F-G-B\textsubscript{b} pentatonic melody’s registral boundaries are C3 to C5, but the sustained downbeat of measure one and the end of the theme prioritize F, which is confirmed as the violins enter completing an F-major triad (Example 3.21).

\textsuperscript{32}The “Love Feast” Leitmotif, along with its harmonic juxtaposition of A\textsubscript{b} and D, is highlighted in the last moments of the opera when the chorus sings “Erlösung dem Erlöser,” as will be shown later in relation to the Phantasy Quintet.
The idyllic, natural world suggested by the pentatonic theme is disrupted by dynamically emphatic semitonal shifts in each voice, progressing from F major to Db/C# minor. These two triads, a major third apart in opposing modes with semitonal shifts in each voice, constitute a hexatonic pole. Richard Cohn and others have written extensively on Wagner’s use of hexatonic poles to convey the uncanny in his operas. It is possible to construct a narrative here that is influenced by the themes in Wagner’s opera. The viola, the only instrument not to participate in Wagner’s opening statement, sounds a pentatonic theme sharing commonalities with the “Love Feast” Leitmotif. This solo instrument has a plausible analog in Parsifal’s status as a solitary pilgrim on a quest for the Grail. Vaughan Williams Anglicizes Wagner’s melody, turning it into a pentatonic, folk-inspired theme. The viola is eventually joined in communion with its comrades, immediately resulting in a decidedly Germanic/Wagnerian hexatonic pole. The semitonal voice leading and major third root motion stand in direct contrast with the intervallic composition of the pentatonic collection, instigating a clash of two distinct musical languages: “old” German romantic chromaticism versus “new” English folk-inspired modal tonality. Six
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parallel first-inversion triads answer the hexatonic pole featuring several cross relations between voices, an implementation of decidedly English compositional techniques from the Renaissance and Restoration eras.\textsuperscript{34}

After a close on A\flat major (note the cadence to the primary key of \textit{Parsifal}), the next section begins with an F-major triad ushering in a solo violin line based on the opening theme (hereafter referred to as theme Y; see Example 3.22).

Example 3.22: I, measures 16-21, violin I, theme Y as modified inverse of theme X

This theme traces the opposite trajectory to the opening theme, albeit with the same pentatonic collection. Thus far, we have heard an alternation of solo and chorale texture, two separate but related thematic statements, and parsimonious voice leading between distant harmonies. Once other voices join the solo violin line (measure 22), we could reasonably expect to hear the same hexatonic pole as before. Instead of D\flat minor, however, F moves to D\flat major in measure 23.

Example 3.23 provides a voice-leading reduction of mm. 10-35. The D\flat introduced by these

Example 3.23: Semitonal voice leading in A and B sections of Prelude, distance from D major

\textsuperscript{34} Vaughan Williams and his peers were aware of the English use of cross-relations due to the rediscovery of Tudor compositions during the Victorian and Edwardian eras. For more information, see Suzanne Cole, \textit{Thomas Tallis and his Music in Victorian England} (Woodbridge, The Boydell Press, 2008) and H.K. Andrews, \textit{The Technique of Byrd’s Vocal Polyphony} (London: Oxford University Press, 1966).
hexatonic shifts has the potential to serve as C#, the leading tone to D. In measure 22, the C in viola II registrally ascends to a D♭ in viola I, a move echoed in the rise of C to C# in viola II in measures 25-26, rooted by A major. The ascent from C to D through its leading tone is repeatedly offered but declined in succession, made explicitly clear in the viola II’s alternating C#-C line in measures 29-36. This relatively unexpected progression serves as an impetus for a compromise and synthesis between these oppositions, which begins in measure 26. Here, the appearance of A major harmonizing theme X hints at D major, solo and chorale textures blend, themes X and Y sound simultaneously, and most importantly, themes X and Y are transformed and bounded by the pitch-class A as opposed to F, the significance of which comes to light later. In considering the overarching compositional goal of F major at the beginning leading to D major at the end, the reharmonization and transposition of theme X over A major demonstrates an attempt to initiate that tonal shift (Example 3.24). This unity is short-lived, however. As seen in the voice leading reduction of measures 32-35 in Example 3.23, the A major eventually gives way to G major, serving as V of V and sending the tonal trajectory back to F.

The remainder of the Prelude continues in this manner to negate any previous transformational progress toward the goal D major. As shown in Example 3.25, two successive hexatonic poles (A major to F minor, B♭ major to F# minor) occur back to back in measures 38-42, eventually descending and completing the return to F major in measure 46.
Ex. 3.24: I, measures 26-29, unity of solo and chorale texture, reharmonized with A major

Ex. 3.25: I, measures 38-39, 41-46, reduction; successive hexatonic poles and F-major resolution

The possibility of tonal and thematic transformation brought about by the unifying A-major section is thereby voided. Example 3.26 summarizes the musical and dramatic argument thus far. The three-part Prelude first presents the F-centric pentatonic representing an idyllic natural state, and its opposition, represented by semitonal voice leading and hexatonic poles. The avoidance of the hexatonic pole in measures 22-23 after the statement of theme Y results in the transformation of melodic material and harmonic support, and incipient success is achieved by their compromise. The failure for this synthesis results in a complete undoing of the preceding harmonic and voice leading activity, and the movement becomes cyclical as opposed to teleological.
A repeated cadential gesture of major six-four triads on F, G, A♭, F sounds as the movement closes exactly as it began: solo viola I playing theme X at pitch, in the unaltered F-centric pentatonic collection.

The conventional Prelude as opening suite movement gives way to an unconventional Scherzo for movement II. While scherzi were occasionally seen in older forms (such as the Bach Partita No. 3 in A minor, BWV 827), they did not gain popularity until the Classical era. If this composition’s purpose was to hearken back to Elizabethan and Jacobean viol fantasies, why compose in a relatively “new” form? As we shall see, the Quintet is actually grouped into two larger units of movements I and II, and III and IV, with movements II and IV parodying their older, more distinguished counterparts.

The Scherzo, in an unexpected 7/4 with a nearly unbroken rhythmic ostinato, is in a broad ABA’ form. While the movement at times highlights D major, including the end in a crucial sense, it also represents a global failure of transformation according to the narrative interpretation proposed here. The A section continuously presents melodies that build in volume, texture, and register, only to collapse at the introduction of a chromatic pitch. The first collapse occurs at a brief appearance of D major. The D-minor rhythmic ostinato builds, leading to a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>“Order” (pentatonic) and “Transgression” (hexatonic pole [HP]) are presented</th>
<th>“Success” / “Compromise”</th>
<th>“Failure” (order wins)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Theme X → HP crisis → Return to F Major</td>
<td>Theme Y → HP evasion (D♭ Major) → Synthesis of musical ideas</td>
<td>HP crisis x2 → Cadence to F → Theme X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-centric</td>
<td>Harmonies imply both D and F via their dominants, but only resolve to F</td>
<td>F-centric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>measures 1-15</td>
<td>measures 16-37</td>
<td>measures 38-59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Example 3.26: Form chart/summary of Prelude, measures 1-59
triumphant D-major climax coinciding with a structural downbeat beginning measure 11 (Example 3.27). The impact of this mode shift is not fully apprehended until the conclusion of the piece. The crucial major third cannot maintain its grasp, B♭ becomes pervasive (measure 15), and the passage falls back to D minor (measure 19). In the following section, another climb is attempted, but the introduction of a C♭ in violin I (measure 24) leads to the registral collapse of the preceding melodic motion, all over an F pedal. This early failure in the Scherzo presages the global failure of the movement, which is not fully perceived until the Sarabande begins.

As F asserts its dominance over D (measures 26-39), an ascending melody inversionally related to the movement’s opening material is passed between voices and becomes increasingly chromaticized as it ascends. It suffers the same fate as its D-centric melodic counterparts from before. After it reaches its melodic peak in measure 48, it descends in the pentatonic collection from the beginning of the Prelude (C-E♭-F-G-B♭) and dwindles away over a D pedal at measure 53 (Example 3.28). D major can now make another attempt to win this battle, and it does so by restating the hexatonic pole, the crisis from measures 10-11 of movement I, at pitch in measure 55. F major shifts to D♭ minor and then major, which now descends to F♯ major as opposed to F. The achievement of F♯ major in measure 61 and its extended prolongation to measure 77 accomplishes something that never occurred in the Prelude by bumping the bass note up a half-step, closer to the orbit of D major. Before, F either held firm or dropped in pitch, but was never raised to allow D to take over. Once this harmonic shift occurs, another compromise ensues: theme X appears in viola I, raised a half step to begin on C♯ (Example 3.29). D major tries to assert its dominance now that F and C are out of the picture, but the systematic climb and collapse occur again in measure 72-80. F♯ major will eventually fall to D minor in measure 81, interestingly a hexatonic pole in itself, and the entire Scherzo begins again.
Example 3.27: II, measures 11-19, achievement of D major collapsing back to D minor
Example 3.28: II, measures 51-80, Prelude recall, achievement of F# major, and collapse to D minor
Example 3.28, cntd.

Example 3.28: II, measures 51-80, Prelude recall, achievement of F# major, and collapse to D minor
Example 3.29: II, measures 66-68, F# major, solo theme X up a half step in viola I

In brief, the recollection of the Prelude in Example 3.28 recontextualizes prior events and leads to a different outcome. In movement I, the series of hexatonic poles achieved nothing—F major still prevailed and theme X remained unchanged. In the Scherzo, the exact same events from the Prelude recur and temporarily defeat F major by tonicizing F#. Once this happens, theme X is raised a half step to C#, one semitone closer to the goal of D. While this “defeat” of F is not maintained, a D pedal will prevail for the A’ section.

In the second rotation of the Scherzo beginning in measure 80, there are ten measures that concisely present the global tonal battle between F, D, and the pentatonic collections with which they are closely associated (Example 3.30). In essence, the exact midpoint of the entire composition summarizes what has come before and what we are still anticipating. Measures 117-120 feature a distorted theme X in the lower voices with a strong emphasis on F and C. There is a sudden shift to D major in measure 121 with a descending melodic figure comprised of the pentatonic collection C-D-E-G-A in violin I. This recalls the transformation of theme X in the
Example 3.30: II, mm. 117-127, highlighting sudden shifts between support for F, D, and their respective pentatonic collections.

Prelude, when the F-centric melody was transposed to highlight the pitches A and E (cf. I, measures 27-36). Measure 123 then reverts to the initial pentatonic collection in viola I to include an F again, and the whole passage concludes on D major. These ten measures present a concise reconstruction of the tonal plan across the first two movements.

The Scherzo concludes with parallel chords recalling those at the end of movement I (measures 47-50), but this time they tonicize D major. The D-major ending sonority is rhetorically deemphasized by the instruments collectively descending in range and dynamics, with all but cello tacet for the final four measures. After the final triad, the solo cello oscillates
between D and E to end on D – but attainment of the major mode is now tenuous due to the
dramatic thinning of texture and dynamics. It appears that D has emerged as tonal victor, but the
ambiguity of mode implies that the story is not yet finished.

Vaughan Williams takes advantage of the jocular nature of the Scherzo in several ways. He
parodies his material from the Prelude, distorting theme X’s serene pentatonic nature and
several of the “cadential” parallel chords. He brings back specific harmonic motions such as the
hexatonic poles and alters their endings, moving into new harmonic territory. In fact, this occurs
on a more local level with the A’ section, which repeats melodic material from A over new bass
lines. The greatest jest of this Scherzo is that the apparent success of ending on D after this
extensive back and forth between F and D was essentially a false alarm. With the start of the
serious, stately Sarabande, we realize that any progress achieved in the complex Scherzo is
nullified.

The following movement, a conventional Sarabande in ternary form, stands in stark
contrast to the novel inclusion of a Scherzo. It adds to the juxtaposed binaries of older versus
newer forms, serious versus playful character, and the tonal battle between F and D. The
temporary victory of D in movement II is negated by the start of the Sarabande on an A♭-major
chord, a tritone away (hearkening back to the A♭-D contradiction in the “Love Feast” Leitmotif
and tonal scheme of Parsifal), and the strong closure in F major in measure 9. The pentatonicism
of the Prelude returns in a soaring melody recalling theme X shared between violin and viola I,
resting on F. As the music cadences (measures 8-9), the parallel chords F minor, G minor, A♭
major, and F minor are heard, further recalling the cadential motion (in minor this time) heard at
the end of movement I.
As suggested earlier, there are several factors pairing the “traditional” movements I and III and the “newer” II and IV. The odd-numbered movements exhibit something more akin to a chorale texture than the others, there is greater pentatonicism, the themes share similarities of rhythm and contour, and the mood is more somber. In a significant reversal from movement I, however, the Sarabande is entirely in four-part voicing with cello tacet, as opposed to a solo voice being eventually reunited with the other instruments in chorale texture. Lastly, this movement also echoes a theme from Parsifal, one that was used in German music for generations: the Dresden Amen, also known as “The Grail” Leitmotif (Examples 3.31a and 3.31b).

The Dresden Amen was a setting by J. G. Naumann for the royal chapel in Dresden in the late 1700s, a common feature in the liturgy and quoted by Mendelssohn in his Symphony No. 5, “Reformation.” Its occurrences in Parsifal are generally associated with the revelation of the Holy Grail to the knights, and it is unique among Wagnerian leitmotifs in that it has pre-established associations with religion. In the prelude to Act I, the “Grail” motive is preceded by a grand pause and highlighted in a pure, diatonic state. In the prelude to Act III, however, the purity of the Dresden Amen is taken away, and it is fragmented and chromaticized until a restored, unison version is emphatically proclaimed. Despite this triumphant acclamation, the cadence to the tonic is continually thwarted here, resolving to fully diminished seventh chords. The symbolism is clear, in that Parsifal’s quest for redemption is not complete. In the final moments of the opera, both the “Love Feast” and “Grail” motives appear simultaneously as the

---


Example 3.31b: Opening of Sarabande from *Phantasy Quintet*, measures 1-4
chorus sings “Redemption to the Redeemer!” (Erlösung dem Erlöser!). The tonal center for the end of the opera is A♭ major, as in the beginning, but there is a significant shift to D major at the first appearance of the words “Höchsten Heiles Wunder! Erlösung dem Erlöser!” The tonal plan Wagner had devised for his opera is achieved in microcosm as the text exclaims “Miracle of supreme salvation! Redemption for the redeemer!” There are several hexatonic poles in this final chorus as well. The occurrence of only these two pivotal themes from Parsifal in the Phantasy Quintet allows for an intertextual reading of thematic and tonal questing for redemption. The journey is lengthy and encounters several impediments, including the loss of smaller achievements along the way (e.g. the reversal of D major’s attainment in the Scherzo).

The B section, measures 18-28, attempts to break the hold that F has on this movement and the piece at large. The key signature for the Sarabande has four flats, and is in a pseudo-F minor tonality with definite A♭-major implications. With the start of the B section, two important chromatic pitches, D♭ and A♭, are introduced and continue to sound throughout the section. These two pitch classes are crucial to the eventual success of D major at the end of the work. Immediately upon their appearance the register begins to collapse, recalling the formal divisions of the Scherzo. With the sectional overlap at measure 28, violin I has a descending line concluding with a D♭ while the first viola brings back the melody from the beginning of the movement. As the chromatic D♭ reverts to D♭, the F-centric melody rises up through the texture and prevails (Example 3.32). The Sarabande closes with the same cadential figure from the Prelude, except the parallel triads are in root position as opposed to second inversion (Example 3.33). Even though the Sarabande is in A♭ major/F minor, its final cadence incorporates D♭ (violin II, measure 38), and concludes in F major like the Prelude.
Example 3.32: III, measures 27-31, demonstrating phrase overlap between B and A’ sections

Example 3.33: I, measures 49-51 (left) and II, measures 38-40 (right), showing same parallel root motion
Vaughan Williams places another unconventional movement, a Burlesca, in opposition to the dignified baroque Sarabande. Interestingly, Bach’s third keyboard Partita also features a Burlesca (in addition to a Scherzo), and one wonders if the composer looked to that composition for inspiration. Nonetheless, this is an uncharacteristic choice for a quintet in the style of English viol fantasies. According to Grove, a Burlesca is “a grotesque dance; parody; an imitation of the dignified, juxtaposing the serious with the comedic.”

Not only does the fourth and final movement stand in stark contrast to the Sarabande, but it also parodies all the movements that preceded it and propels the Phantasy Quintet to a successful tonal conclusion.

The final movement’s cello ostinato begins with a melodic gesture presenting the entire narrative of the Phantasy Quintet in microcosm: F descending to D (Example 3.34a). The ostinato will highlight these two pitches, always returning to D. Vaughan Williams builds this section in texture and register as he did in the Scherzo, but this time with layering of themes in counterpoint to one another. The melodies here are clearly derived from the preceding movements but are so obscured (emphasizing the grotesque aspect of this genre) that it is difficult to determine their origin. Vaughan Williams’s economy of material is impressive, and is in keeping with Germanic compositional practices. The second melody (Example 3.34b) is almost completely derived from the tail of theme X, hereafter called motive Z, which will be the most significant collection of pitches in this movement.

The third contrapuntal melody (Example 3.34c), beginning measure 17, is split between viola II and violin II. Closer hearing reveals it as a dance form of theme Y from the Prelude. These three thematic statements, themselves derivatives of earlier melodies, become further distorted as the Burlesca progresses. As the three melodies build in volume, texture and register,

---

Example 3.34a: IV, measures 1-8, cello ostinato featuring F to D at outset

Example 3.34b: IV, measures 8-13 (above); melody derived from I, measures 1-4, motive Z (below)

Example 3.34c: IV, measures 17-23 in Burlesca (above); derived from Theme Y from Prelude, 16-23 (below)
a new section begins in measure 45 emphasizing F as tonic, featuring the original pentatonic collection from the Prelude, C-Eb-F-G-Bb (Example 3.35).

Example 3.35: IV, measures 45-49, tonicization of F with C-Eb-F-G-Bb pentatonic in violin I

As this section closes in descending pentatonic groupings, D and F oscillate in the bass (measures 78-89), generating relative ambiguity as to where the next section will lead tonally. Surprisingly, the ostinato melody returns and is reharmonized in D major (measure 90), which, like its occurrence in the Scherzo, is short-lived. Both the F# and C#, essential to D major, are quickly negated and lead to yet another return of theme X in measure 107, accompanied by a sustained Eb-major seventh chord in four-three inversion (Examples 3.36a and 3.36b). Note the voicing of this chord: there are five Ds over an Eb-major triad (the pitches of which are all a semitone away from D major). The desired semitonal descent to D, shown in brackets, will not occur. Theme X emerges from the sonority in viola I, transposed up another half step from its
appearance in movement II, finally beginning on D. Violin I answers with a theme Y, transposed up a step from measure 16 of movement I to highlight G and D rather than F and C. Theme Y expands into a lengthy D minor pentatonic cadenza and leads to the return of the presto dance melody from Example 3.35. Previously centered on F, the jig is now in a fleeting D major for one beat before returning to D minor following a G-major embellishing chord (measures 117-118). The tables are starting to turn from F to D, but there is still one problem: pitch-class F is still featured in the melodies and pentatonic collections, presaging resolution to D minor rather than the narrative and structural goal of D major.

Motive Z’s new tonal orientation in the cello ostinato will be the catalyst for the long-awaited close in D major. The final return of the boisterous jig-like melody quickly grinds to a halt, clearing the stage for the cello ostinato to return (measure 140) and supplant pitch class F. Example 3.37 shows the viola’s opening theme from movement I with motive Z on the pitches
Example 3.36b: IV, measures 106-117, cadenza and actual resolution into D-minor Presto
Example 3.37: I, viola, measures 1-4 (top); IV, cello, measures 1-8 (middle); IV, measures 144-160 (bottom), showing ascending motive Z in all voices, registral displacement of F by F#, and final cadence to D major
F-G-B♭-C; the cello ostinato figure and its transposition of motive Z to G-A-C-D (first heard in viola in measure 140); and the concluding measures of the piece. When the ostinato lands on G in measure 146, the other voices hand off a pentatonic collection beginning on that pitch, isolating and expanding motive Z to G-A-C-D-E (ascending in register this time – a change from all the previous registral collapses in earlier movements). At measure 152, the first violin reaches A6, at first harmonized by F major, but as it reiterates motive Z, its apex is reharmonized and F major finally resolves to the long-awaited D major.

Vaughan Williams embedded a narrative within the Phantasy Quintet that can be construed at both a local level and a broad, macroscopic one. The common-tone progression from an F-major triad to the concluding D major constitutes the former while the transformation of thematic material and its constituent motives limns a more circuitous path. On a larger scale, the contrasting genres of subsequent movements facilitate the gradual alteration of pitch class and thematic material by way of their parodist characteristics. It is the “new” style of composition and its distortion of the idyllic themes that allows for the eventual success and transformation to take place. The near-quotations of leitmotifs from Parsifal enhance the narrative reading of a harmonic quest from F major to D major. In fact, one could assert that Vaughan Williams is indeed following in the footsteps of his German romantic predecessors in demonstrating redemption through chromatic tonal transformation. For the Phantasy Quintet, Vaughan Williams takes inspiration from his predecessors and puts his unique, English stamp on it. While the commission for this piece specifically stated that it should look back to sixteenth-century compositions, Vaughan Williams is clearly championing a newer style that blends old
English idioms with modern techniques. In so doing, the composer exploits the very constraints of Cobbett’s commission to enact a striking narrative of transgression, conflict, and resolution.

The Piano Quintet in C minor and Phantasy Quintet, composed approximately ten years apart, exhibit vastly different narrative trajectories. The earlier student work, an attempt to merge continental compositional ideals impressed upon Vaughan Williams by his teacher at the RCM—especially Brahmsian influences—with his nationalistic pet project of English folk song, was in the end unsuccessful; the two styles were unable to be reconciled thematically. The interest in the English “other” prevailed, eventually leading the composer to enact a publication embargo. The next decade saw Vaughan Williams finding compositional success with art songs, *A Sea Symphony*, and Fantasia on a Theme by Thomas Tallis, along with traveling more in Germany, the United Kingdom, and studies with Ravel in France. The later Phantasy Quintet, submitted for Cobbett’s competition, demonstrates the maturity attained by the composer in the ensuing years. This condensed cyclic sonata manages to contrast English modality with Germanic (particularly Wagnerian) thematic influences in addition to old and new compositional techniques and forms, but achieves an elegant synthesis between the disparate agents.
CHAPTER FOUR: WAR AND NOSTALGIA IN REBECCA CLARKE’S PIANO TRIO

If the opposite of war is peace, the opposite of experiencing moments of war is proposing moments of pastoral. Since war takes place outdoors and always within nature, its symbolic status is that of the ultimate antipastoral. In Northrop Frye’s terms, it belongs to the demonic world, and no one engages in it or contemplates it without implicitly or explicitly bringing to bear the contrasting ‘model world’ by which its demonism is measured.¹

Rebecca Clarke composed her Piano Trio in 1921, two years after her Viola Sonata, both of which were submitted for arts patron Elizabeth Sprague Coolidge’s annual Competition of the Berkshire Chamber Music Festival in Pittsfield, Massachusetts.² These works, along with the Rhapsody for Cello and Piano (1923), are the most substantial and well known of her compositional output. Much of Clarke’s music fell into relative obscurity in the latter half of the twentieth century, but her compositions are now attracting increased scholarly attention. A comparative analysis of the Viola Sonata and Piano Trio can be found in Bryony Jones’s contribution to A Rebecca Clarke Reader. As is the case with the other works examined in this dissertation, the Piano Trio is a three-movement cyclic sonata, with a lengthy return to first movement material toward the end of the finale. In addressing this thematic reprise in her chapter, Jones remarks, “…despite the evident importance of motifs from the first movement’s exposition, the work ends with material singular to the third. In this way the general feeling is one of looking forward rather than back…”³ This analysis will show that, rather than looking

³ Ibid, 91.
forward, the post-World War I Trio recalls the faint memory of the Britain that once was, but could never be recaptured. Clarke was born and raised in England to a German mother and an American father. Her music studies brought her to the Royal Academy of Music in 1903, and then to the Royal Conservatory of Music, where she was Sir Charles Villiers Stanford’s first female student. She was an accomplished violist and chamber musician in England but spent much of her adult life in America. Clarke was one of the first women to perform in the Queen’s Hall Orchestra in 1912, and toured the United States, Hawaii, and British colonies as a professional musician during World War I and thereafter. She was well acquainted with Ralph Vaughan Williams, Eugene Goossens, Gustav Holst, and Frank Bridge, and had the curious honor of reading Maurice Ravel’s tarot cards at a post-concert party. Her lifelong friendship with Elizabeth Sprague Coolidge first blossomed after submitting her Viola Sonata for the Competition of the Berkshire Chamber Music Festival, where it tied for first place with Ernest Bloch’s Viola Suite (Coolidge cast the deciding vote, not knowing who had composed which piece). The influence of Debussy (and Bloch, whom she greatly admired and later “cribbed from”) is writ large in Clarke’s chamber music, particularly the three weighty works composed while touring the globe as a chamber musician between 1919 and 1923.

4 Several scholars have explored the question of whether or not music has a narrator or the power to express a past tense. Fully exploring the possibility for musical memory is outside the scope of this study; a few essential works include Jean-Jacques Nattiez and Katharine Ellis, “Can One Speak of Narrativity in Music?” Journal of the Royal Musical Association 115, no. 2 (1990), 240-257; Carolyn Abbate, “What the Sorcerer Said,” 19th-Century Music 12, no. 3 (Spring, 1989), 221-230; and Michael Klein, “Chopin’s Fourth Ballade as Musical Narrative,” Music Theory Spectrum 26, no. 1 (Spring 2004), 23-56.

5 For further insight into Rebecca Clarke’s life, career, and writings, see A Rebecca Clarke Reader, ed. Liane Curtis (Rebecca Clarke Society, Inc., 2004).

6 Interview with Robert Sherman, “Rebecca Clarke about Herself,” in A Rebecca Clarke Reader, ed. Liane Curtis (Rebecca Clarke Society, Inc., 2004), 177-179.


8 Interview with Robert Sherman, 175.
While Clarke was not actually residing in England during the latter half of World War I—she began her U.S. residency in 1916—the magnitude and gravity of the Great War forever changed the means of artistic expression that followed it. Clarke never stated that any of her works were explicitly related to or about wartime, but it is not unreasonable to suggest that there are motives and themes in all three works of these immediate post-war years that refer to this dark time in Europe’s history. In addressing the idea of musical memory in the Piano Trio, my analysis will highlight nostalgia for a pre-war British idyll while in the midst of conflict, and then show how the experience of war affects the view of the past as well as the outlook for the future. In the Trio, these ideas are manifested through the juxtaposition of various alternative pitch collections from octatonic, whole tone, pentatonic, chromatic, and modal; the trajectory of clear-cut formal constructions to something less definable; and the altered recalls and juxtaposition of thematic material across movements. Pitch collections and themes often manifest as identifiable topics that guide one through shifting temporal boundaries. In a larger sense, though, it is the contrast between the comparably consonant, pastoral, folk topics and the aggressively dissonant surrounding material that is essential to my narrative analysis.

The first movement opens with an aggressive fanfare-like introduction to the sonata form proper (Example 4.1). The piano’s sixteenth-note sextuplet motif can be interpreted as a musical representation of a rapid-fire machine gun (hereafter referred to as “M”), and there are crashing dissonances in the right hand of the piano, along with tritone double stops in the violin and cello
Example 4.1: I, measures 1-9, introductory fanfare in OCT I
that together make up a French augmented-sixth chord construction (hereafter Fr+6).\(^9\) The fanfare introduction is entirely comprised of pitches from the octatonic I collection (hereafter abbreviated as OCT I).\(^{10}\) The aggressive introductory fanfare gives way to dreamlike arpeggiated figures, still comprised of pitches from the OCT I collection, as the sonata form begins; Example 4.2 provides a form chart of the movement.

The P-zone theme is derived from M, exploiting the opening melodic whole step B\(_\flat\)-C-B\(_\flat\), and composed out into a lamentation by the cello (measure 9ff.). The violin joins in unison (measure 13), and it is subsequently transposed up from beginning on B\(_\flat\), to C, to F\#\(_\flat\), and then A. The P-zone begins in OCT I, carried over from the fanfare, and shifts to OCT II—with a few chromatic passing tones as exceptions—when M is transposed by T5 in measure 12. Tension builds, leading into the Tr, which reaches a climax at measure 33 when a marcato bugle call (“B” hereafter) is sounded in B\(_\flat\) major in the piano and cello (Example 4.3). At the entrance of B, the tumult of the previous 32 measures gradually dissipates in texture and volume. After being entirely bombarded with octatonicism to this point, what seems to be the appearance of a pure, major triad upends our sense of “normalcy.” We have become entirely accustomed to the dissonant features of the octatonic at this point, and it is this triadic, traditional sonority that is marked as unusual. Despite the triadic arpeggiation, motive B and the S-theme it begets are not entirely unmitigated. B quietly emerges from the octatonic rubble as the cello and piano sustain B\(_\natural\) around it, and it will persist as a maximally dissonant, syncopated pedal throughout the statement of the triadic S-theme. The tumult of war represented by octatonicism and M begins to

---

\(^9\) The Fr+6 construction, particularly when comprised of the pitch classes C-E-F\#-B\(_\flat\), is an important and recurring sonority throughout the Trio, as it is the only tetrachordal subset common to both OCT and WT collections. This chapter will track its structurally significant appearances and its narrative function as a unifying sonority.

\(^{10}\) I will refer to the disparate octatonic collections as OCT I (C/C\#), OCT II (C/D), and OCT III (C\#/D). For whole-tone collections, WT 0 will indicate the collection that features C, and WT I will include C\#. All other alternative pitch collections will be designated by their complete names.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Divisions</th>
<th>Mm.</th>
<th>Components</th>
<th>Themes/Motives</th>
<th>Expressive Content</th>
<th>Pitch Collections</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exposition</td>
<td>1-8</td>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>Motive M; Fr(^+6) construction (C-E-F(^#)-B); “dreamlike” arpeggios</td>
<td>Aggressive, forceful, mysterious</td>
<td>OCT I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9-25</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P-theme based on Motive M, transposed up and fragmented</td>
<td>Builds tension, theme in canon and augmentation, progressively higher register and thicker texture</td>
<td>OCT I (\rightarrow) OCT II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26-40</td>
<td>Tr</td>
<td>Fragmented P-theme, legato strings (\rightarrow) BUGLE!</td>
<td>Higher register (\rightarrow) climax and appearance of Bugle (motive B), texture rapidly thins</td>
<td>OCT II (\rightarrow) B(^#) bugle breaks OCT II, B(^#) pedal obscures triadic purity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41-65</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S-theme (triadic, modal inflection); dissonant, syncopated B(^#) pedal point; 3 statements of S</td>
<td>“modal” with dissonant pedal (\rightarrow) OCT III (\rightarrow) D(_{G#})-dorian leading to chromatic aggregate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>66-75</td>
<td>Closing</td>
<td>Modal tune, S-derived</td>
<td>Calm, pastoral</td>
<td>A(_{D,A})-mixolydian, DM7/9 accomp. chords</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td>76-101</td>
<td>Central Action Zone</td>
<td>Primarily based on motive M</td>
<td>Marcato (\rightarrow) vigoroso e pesante, gradually growing in intensity</td>
<td>OCT II, m3 cycle (\rightarrow) oscillation between OCT collections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>102-116</td>
<td>Retransition</td>
<td>“minor” S-theme (piano), motive M-based A pedal (strings); cello and violin on P-derived legato lines</td>
<td>Sempre ff, thick texture with doubling, appassionato</td>
<td>m. 107, return of OCT I and Fr(^+6) construction to set up recap.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>117-132</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>More contrapuntal than in expo</td>
<td>Ominous, vcl and vln no longer in unison</td>
<td>OCT I and II simultaneously (\rightarrow) OCT II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>133-139</td>
<td>Tr</td>
<td>Truncated return, no bugle, collective breath (m. 139)</td>
<td></td>
<td>At-pitch restatement from expo (OCT II)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>140-157</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Melodic S-statement 2x; chords arpeggiated in piano; dissonant pedal in piano and vcl</td>
<td>Still misterioso, but the more florid texture adds an urgency and anxiety that it did not have in expo</td>
<td>Same as before, but transposed down by whole step. Second statement F(_{B#})-dorian (?) (\rightarrow) chromatic aggregate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>158-166</td>
<td>Closing</td>
<td>Modal tune, S-derived</td>
<td>Pastoral, pp</td>
<td>D(_{G#})-mixolydian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>167-198</td>
<td>Coda</td>
<td>1. F-bugle in canon between strings/piano, Gb dissonance 2. Elegiac P-zone in canon between cello/piano (\rightarrow) Fr(^+6) 3. Vln motive M; vcl WT 0 sighing gesture; pno on Fr(^+6) construction (\rightarrow) B(^#)-B(^#) vcl/pno resolution, A in vln</td>
<td>1. wistful, ppp, pizzicato 2. Espressivo, più lento (\rightarrow) pained in m. 178 3. espressivo, pp, morendo, bleak, registral descent; vln m. 177 attempts energetic resolution, falls in bleak resignation</td>
<td>1. OCT II 2. mostly OCT III until return of OCT I in m. 178 3. OCT I (vln), WT 0 (vcl); Fr(^+6) common tones between them, (pno); final sonority OCT I subset</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Example 4.2: Piano Trio mvmt. I, form chart
Example 4.3: 1, measures 32-48, climax of Tr leading to bugle call (B, boxed) and S-theme (piano)
clear as the bugle call triggers a serene, modal, musical memory, but it will be tainted by the lasting effects of conflict.

Motive B is rhythmically derived from M, seen in the sixteenth-note sextuplets. Bryony Jones remarks that this particular bugle call is reminiscent of “The Last Post,” which traditionally is played in British infantry regiments to signal the end of the day’s activities, or at military funerals to indicate the soldier has gone to his/her final rest.\(^{11}\) The bugle call, symbolizing an ending of some sort, conjures up the S-theme, which provides a sharp contrast with the material that preceded it. S is built upon the opening perfect fourth of B (F-B\(~\)), and becomes a triadic, modally inflected, lyrical tune comprised of planed triads. At first, the melody seems to have B\(~\) as its tonal center, but modally closes on G\(~\) after eight measures. While the tune and its harmonic support cannot be categorized as exploiting one specific mode, the effect is clear. The P-zone’s emphasis was on seventh chords, bombast, and dissonances of seconds, sevenths, and tritones; the S-zone is *pianissimo, misterioso*, and almost entirely comprised of major and minor triads. There is also a descending pentatonic figure in measures 44-45 that will appear in other modally-inflected tunes throughout the Trio. The antagonistic B\(~\) pedal eventually descends chromatically through B\(~\) and A\(~\) against the quasi-cadential G\(~\)-D\(~\) open fifths as the theme closes. The A\(~\) breaks the ethereal effect of the S-theme, and we hear two more statements of it: one in OCT III (measure 49) and another that progresses from being initially modal (measure 59) to entirely chromatic (measures 62-65). This final statement of S begins as an almost unsullied iteration of D\(~\)/D-Dorian\(^{12}\) but is only capable of sounding the first two measures of the eight-measure melody, as if the tune cannot be fully recalled under these

---


\(^{12}\) The modal collections that appear throughout the Trio often have a melodic modal center that is in contrast with the harmonic underpinning. When this occurs, I will refer to the melodic mode and modal final with a subscript for the bass-line support. In measure 56, the melody is D-Dorian, but the piano holds a G-D pedal that is noted in the subscript.
conditions. It gives way to the full chromatic aggregate for the final four measures of the S-theme, which dovetails into the closing material beginning in measure 66. The modal closing tune emerges from the latter half of the S-theme’s melody, contextually cadencing “on D,” with DM7/9 chords in the piano.

The relative calm brought about by the S-theme is immediately negated with the return of OCT II in the fiery development section, which primarily focuses on P-zone material. Heavy tritone octaves in the piano lend a threatening tenor to this section, and a single fortissimo exclamation of the first four measures of S appear at the end of the section (measure 104), the impetus for the shift from OCT II to OCT I for the recapitulation beginning in measure 117.

There are subtle changes to the exposition’s musical material in the recapitulation, but the contrasting modal S-zone (measures 140-157) is where the greatest alterations are found. As to be expected, it reappears transposed, here down a whole step—the melody centers on Es at first with a pizzicato A pedal in the cello—but the stillness conveyed by the theme’s original presentation has been supplanted with thirty-second-note arpeggios doubling the theme in the piano. Adding to this increasingly florid texture, the cello eventually plays its own counterpoint to the modal melody as the piano maintains the A pedal on its own. Throughout the Trio, material previously associated with consonance, modal inflection, and the pastoral topic will return later in the movement in a corrupted, dissonant way. It is as if a musical recollection of “modal” pre-War life, after interacting with the octatonically-represented tumult of war, is irrevocably changed and its purity cannot be re-attained, much like the human psyche after enduring a traumatic experience. In Paul Fussell’s The Great War and Modern Memory, he alludes to this same technique in literary memoirs. “Such moments of brief recurrence to the pastoral ideal are like miniatures of these ‘bucolic interludes’ or ‘pastoral oases’…”
Great War memoir generally provides a number of such moments sandwiched between bouts of violence and terror.”

After the closing material’s return over a G pedal, a 32-measure coda begins with the recollection of the B motive in F major over G in measure 167. Motive B was missing from the recapitulation, where the transitional material led to a collective breath before launching directly into the S-zone (measure 139). This time, the triadic motive B in F major is answered with discordant pizzicato double stops in the strings (mm. 167-169). The cello’s bass note mimics the opening fourth of motive B, but on the pitches C# and F#, in effect echoing the bugle in the maximally dissonant F# major. The upper cello notes, combined with the violin line, outline an F-major triad, and the G# in the piano is enharmonically equivalent to F#. This reappearance of motive B in the coda is presented simultaneously at the interval of a half step, significantly amplifying the dissonance from its first occurrence in measure 37. Instead of one dissonant pedal tone, the F/F# clash is articulated with more complexity. The dissonant G# pedal (matching the B# /B# clash from the S-zone) is also a result of musical material bleeding over into the next section. In the exposition, B# was a holdover from the P-zone’s excessive octatonicism. In this case, it is the piano’s fragmentation of the final two measures of modal closing material that provides the dissonance. It is interesting that a modal melody, a symbol of an untarnished past, would clash with the bugle’s triadic memory trigger, but serves to underscore the corruption of the modal past given what motive B ushers in at its reappearance. An elegiac, canonic presentation of the P-zone follows, this time piu lento, pianissimo, and espressivo. The majority of this statement is comprised of pitches from OCT III, with the exception of a few neighbor notes. The difference in expressive character in the coda, with the conspicuous absence of the sixteenth-note machine gun

sextuplets, carries a funerary air of lethargy and exhaustion. An E♭ in the cello in measure 177, in conjunction with a five-note chord in the piano, shifts the material back to OCT I. This five-note chord, C-F♯-B♭-E-E♭, is the “Mystic Chord” with one missing pitch. This chord is also the French augmented-sixth chord that opened the work, with an added E♭ in the highest voice in the piano that moves up by half step to E♯ on beat three. The five-note iteration is only an OCT I subset, since it contains both E and E♭, whereas the four-note collection is a subset of both OCT I and WT 0. The pure augmented-sixth construction will remain the only notes the piano plays until measure 186, and its importance comes to light here. After this chord’s appearance in the piano, a new theme emerges in the cello while an arco M motive sounds in the violin. Beginning in measure 179, the cello’s descending sighing espressivo gesture in eighth notes is comprised of the entirety of the WT 0 collection. This is the first time a whole-tone collection has appeared in any substantial way, as the movement primarily consisted of mostly-strict octatonicism with occasional modal contrast. There is a first-time interaction of WT and OCT elements in the strings, and the piano’s four pitches are, as previously mentioned, the common tones between those two collections and serves to unify them.

As the first movement dies away with the Fr+6 in the piano and descending major thirds in the cello (exploiting the WT 0 collection), an exceptionally marked motive M is heard for a fourth time in the violin (measure 187). It crescendos and accelerates into a surprising, sforzando, descending resolution to A and immediately dies away. Each time motive M has occurred to this point, the sextuplet figure ascended by whole step, and the reversal of the gesture into a half-step descent to close the movement exudes desperation and alienation. Clarke’s expression markings for the sextuplet imbue the gesture with a sense of gaining momentum, yet it lacks the strength to ascend once more and languishes, exhausted, on A. It makes one more
attempt to ascend via an [014] trichord, recalling measures 18-19, in measure 191 (A-C-D♭), but collapses in retrograde-symmetrical “failure.” This failure is all the more significant when considered in light of the activity in cello and piano during these final measures. The piano alternates between C-D♭ in the bass, eventually climbing to an E♭-B♭ open fifth for the final cadence. The cello also moves from a quadruple stop on a C7 chord to the same open fifths as the piano, aiming toward closure between all instruments. When the violin attempts this, the [014] trichord ascends up through C-D♭, echoing the piano’s motion, but is unable to complete the journey to a unison E♭. It collapses on a note of not only resignation, but also one of both half-step and tritone dissonance with the other instruments, a tragic and gritty end that does not resolve the most significant dissonances that pervaded the movement.

Whereas the nostalgic modal melodies in the first movement were consistently denied a presentation unencumbered by dissonance, the second movement makes a space for modal purity. This movement can be understood as a tonally ambiguous beginning, comprised of a mélange of WT, OCT, and diatonic pitch spaces, that follows a path to the center of the movement, and therefore of the piece. The central theme of the Trio’s second movement is a plaintive modal melody, and is the nostalgic centerpiece of a work that continually corrupts memories (Example 4.4). Theme D_C/G, so named for its mostly D-Dorian modal identity at its first appearance with C-G open fifth harmonic support, emerges gradually from musical breadcrumbs sown in movement I and the opening of movement II.

While Movement II’s formal construction is difficult to identify, it features four distinct musical units (Example 4.5). The movement begins and ends with something resembling an
Example 4.4: II, mm. 37-44 (downbeat), showing D\textsubscript{C/G}-dorian melody in piano
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Divisions</th>
<th>mm.</th>
<th>Themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Introit”</td>
<td>1-8</td>
<td>“Chant” melody (M-derived) → Fr₆</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>constructions → “Near-Mystic chord” and counterpoint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Changes based on gradually filled out texture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Misterioso</em>, wandering, seeking contextualization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>As-yet unknown fragmentary presentation of central theme’s melody</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A section</td>
<td>9-25</td>
<td>Pno ostinato (M-derived) → vcl melody from m. 7 → vln enters, canon, return of motive M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“Modal” → OCT II with vln entrance → OCT III → OCT I. OCT emphasized melodically and in harmonic support of “7 chords and V7 constructions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>As texture builds, so does register, rhythmic activity, and dynamics. Continual tension building. Motive M entrance (18, vlc) <em>molto espressivo</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Seemingly modal ostinato transformed into octatonic partitioning, esp. mm. 22-25.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitional</td>
<td>26-34</td>
<td>String chorale texture: triadic, symmetrical. Piano “7” flourishes in contrast, carried over from A section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mostly OCT strings and piano, motive M in m. 34 negates OCT possibility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Eerie, expressivo, calmato, generally hushed and ominous, leading to motive M fanfare gesture in piano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Intervallic compression of motive M. Staid strings with dissonant, screaming piano.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C section</td>
<td>35-50</td>
<td>Theme D, diatonic counterpoint in all other voices. Two statements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D(CC)G-dorian (mostly) in piano; then D(AE)E-dorian in strings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Espressivo, molto calmato</em>, nostalgic, pastoral, pure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental</td>
<td>51-64</td>
<td>Based on pno ostinato, featuring bugle, and devolving into arpeggiated diminished descents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Eb reverts back to OCT II → OCT III → OCT I mm. 59-64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Canon, florid texture, rise and fall of register and dynamics across the section, doubling of voices increases intensity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gradual build to pure octatonicism coincides with climax of movement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C’ section</td>
<td>65-71</td>
<td>Theme D transposed down by 5th, Fr₆ and harmonics accompaniment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G(F₆-6)-dorian (+6 construction is OCT subset)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Distorted, eerie, no closure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Only one statement of the melody.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Introit”</td>
<td>72-84</td>
<td>Material from beginning features oCT completion in m. 80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fr₆ in piano under vcl theme, chromaticized fragments of theme D in piano, “G-lydian (?)” vln line expands registrally to complete octatonic collection, ends on G major.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dying away, texture thinning, expansion of “introit” melody is highly dissonant over G pedal, striving to break free. Sinks back down in resignation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reversal of order from beginning makes theme D fragments retroactively come to the fore.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Example 4.5: Piano Trio, mvmt. II, form chart*
introit, which is slightly expanded at its reappearance (measure 75). The chant-like solo melody over a drone pitch seems to portend something grander, and indeed it will serve as the basis for the material that follows. This introit (Example 4.6) only gradually reveals its harmonic and scalar identity as layers are continuously added.

Example 4.6: II, mm. 1-9 (downbeat), melodic components of modal theme in strings (boxed)
Coming from a stringently octatonic first movement with contrasting modal themes and a brief suggestion of whole tone at the very end, we expect more octatonicism at the outset of this movement. The opening is centered on G, and the first four notes recall theme M with its initial ascending whole step. After descending to G, it appears the melody might be G-lydian, but a B appears, calling the “majorness” or “minorness” of the theme into question (G-major/minor-lydian?). Additionally, if the A is considered a passing tone, the collectional identity would be OCT III. In measure 5, the possibility of octatonicism is negated when the melody is transposed up a whole step to C#, now centered around A major/minor. The transposed melody is met with a French augmented-sixth construction in the piano built on bass note B, revising our opinion once more. If the lowered “third scale degrees” are considered an aberration, the first six measures would present the entirety of WT 1. This appears to be where the introduction of the cello’s whole-tone sighing gesture in the first movement was heading.

In measure 7, all three instruments sound together for two measures before the A section begins. Measure 7 is relatively dissonant, while the voices consonate as they settle into a quasi-cadence to elide with the next phrase. The downbeat of measure 7 features a five-note harmony that has the same intervallic content of measure 177 in movement I, and contains C-E-F#-B, the augmented-sixth construction that opened the work. Here, it appears at the first instance of all three voices sounding together, and initiates a melodic close to the first main section of the movement. The influence of Debussy is heard in this opening, but particularly in the textures of measures 7 and 8, which feature quartal harmonies in the piano’s right hand and parallel fifths in the left, elaborated melodically in the violin and cello, respectively. The string parts here warrant closer examination. The violin opens with an E-A melodic fifth in measure 7, which will become the opening of the cello melody in the next section. It also features the descending melody D-B-
A-B-F♯, with a C♯ approached in the next beat, closely approximating the descending latter half of the S-theme from movement I, which descended on G♯-F-E-D-B. In measure eight, the cello plays E-E-D-C♯-A-B, which looks ahead to the highlighted modal theme later in this movement.

Following the ambiguity and sheer eventfulness of the opening, the following section begins by projecting a paradoxically lyrical and monotonous presence. Measures 9 through 25 feature a piano ostinato almost entirely throughout (it breaks down in the last measure of the section). The three-against-two ostinato over a D-A pedal is derived from the first six notes of the movement, which in turn was derived from the M theme that opened the work. With the ostinato centered on D with a G♯ in the upper voice, it appears that D-lydian modality will govern this section. The cello’s entrance in the upbeat to measure 11 confirms this, but once the violin joins, the C♯ at the downbeat of measure thirteen nullifies the lydian mode. Taking the E in the piano part as a passing tone, the collection has veered into OCT II, subtly bringing back the first movement’s associations of war and terror. In only thirteen measures, our understanding of the pitch collections in the movement has progressed thusly, as represented below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>mm. 1-4</th>
<th>mm. 5-6</th>
<th>mm. 7-8</th>
<th>mm. 9-12</th>
<th>m. 13ff.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Near-mystic chord, dissonant→ consonant, strings elaborate piano’s harmonies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Example 4.7: Real-time tonal understanding of movement II’s opening measures**

The rest of the ostinato section gradually grows in texture and intensity, featuring canons between the string parts, increased chromaticism, and heightened register. The entrance of M in measure 18 triggers the “correction” of E in the piano part, which previously did not belong in the prevailing OCT collection, to E♯, and a return to pure octatonicism (OCT II). The relative stability of D-lydian and OCT II gives way to rapid shifts between OCT I and III with the
emergence of fully-diminished and dominant seventh sonorities in measures 22-25, causing the end of this section to feel unsettled and ominous, and more in keeping with movement I. These three measures serve as a bridge into the transition that follows.

Triadic purity and octatonic chromaticism collide in the ensuing transitional passage, in a highly marked moment where the canonic, florid texture of the preceding measures grinds to a halt. The antiphonal construction in measures 26-34 is not only a textural contrast to the A section, but also between the triadic strings and ornate, diminished-seventh arpeggiations in the piano. The strings begin the transition at a piano dynamic, featuring a retrograde symmetrical melody and a compression of the earlier ostinato’s opening whole step to a half step. A rhythmic relationship to motive M’s sextuplets followed by quarter note can also be gleaned due to the strings’ anapestic rhythm. Despite the eeriness that the strings’ melody imparts, they present an element of triadic purity that has largely been missing in the Trio. The piano answers the chorale-style triads in measure 28 on a screaming minor ninth dissonance, emphasized by extremes of register between the hands, and forces the G-major strings into an OCT III context. When the strings return with piano tacet in measure 29, they present a purely modal progression that also happens to fit OCT III, a reaction to the prior interruption. The strings’ fragile triadic purity is seeking to assert itself, and is undermined continually in this section by the piano’s entrenched octatonicism. The piano’s arpeggiated sweep is a melodic hold-over from the A section, while the triadic attempt at modality in the strings looks ahead toward its full flourishing in the upcoming central modal theme of the movement. As the transition ends, M is heard in the piano at measure 33, beginning on C#, and unexpectedly “resolving” to D. Relative consonance is achieved at this downbeat, as the strings play open fifths on G-D and C-G over the piano’s G-centric motive M.
Finally, following the scattered hints of psychological relief in the preceding music, the distant, \textit{ppp} iteration of motive M whisks us into the realm of untainted memory for measures 35-51 (refer back to Example 4.4). The effect of the faint “fanfare” gesture, indicative of war, seems to trigger a nostalgia for an idealized past. The texture of the middle section reinforces that mental image, with a haze of string harmonics, an undulating 4:3:2 metric dissonance between the separate voices, and predictable eight-measure phrases. The plaintive melody that emerges in the piano, considered on its own, conforms almost entirely to the D-dorian mode, with one exception.

Beginning in measure 39 with the second phrase of the melody, the descending figure introduces the raised third scale degree F\# that is outside the mode and therefore highly marked. This particular instance of markedness injects a possible personal element into the wartime narrative. George Butterworth, an English composer who was killed in World War I, studied with Stanford at RCM and was friends with Rebecca Clarke.\textsuperscript{14} While Butterworth did not produce a vast oeuvre, most of his works were arrangements of English folk tunes for voice and piano, including \textit{6 Songs from A Shropshire Lad}, \textit{11 Songs from Sussex}, and \textit{Bredon Hill and Other Songs}. The first of the \textit{Shropshire} songs is arguably his most well-known composition, a setting of “Loveliest of Trees.” The opening measures are reproduced in Example 4.8. For Clarke, the C-section’s nostalgic melody—specifically, the descending major stepwise perfect fifth with the turn figure—is an exact transposition of this opening piano figure from Butterworth’s song. Indeed, the majority of the melodic fragments that comprise this central theme can be found in Butterworth’s other compositions, including “The True Lover’s Farewell” and “When the Lad for Longing Sighs.” While Clarke never admitted that this composition was a

response to the devastation of World War I or that it served in any capacity as an homage to Butterworth, it is possible to make the connection on the basis of these striking melodic resemblances. The fact that this five-note figure contains a chromatically marked note in an otherwise entirely diatonic melodic context in Clarke’s Trio and is the first melodic utterance in his song seems remarkable. This biographical detail, ascribed to such an objectively special moment in the composition, adds another layer of complexity to the notion of an unobtainable past; as such, it amplifies the already tragic subtext of Clarke’s compositional narrative.

Even though almost all of theme D’s pitches reside in D_{C/G}-dorian with the exception of the F#, there is also a B♭ in the bass support in measure 41. Despite these two pitches, the entire passage exudes a quality of pastoral, idyllic calm. Even some of that chromatic obscurity abates in the second statement of the theme (measures 44-51), when the invariant melody is reharmonized in the “relative minor,” resulting in D_{A/F}-dorian. This purity and serenity, if not a direct homage to Butterworth, is at the very least the musical embodiment of Edwardian England in “the summer of 1914,” when the impending war seemed to be a relatively innocuous idea abstractly discussed at afternoon gatherings.
Of course, this is seven years in the past now, and that England cannot be reclaimed. An E♭ yelp in the cello leads into an OCT II developmental section (measures 54-64), in which the ostinato from earlier in the movement returns, along with M (measure 54, cello) and the fateful bugle (B, measures 56 and 58, cello). Unlike B’s stately appearances in movement I, it appears more frantic and insistent here. This developmental section, passing through all three OCT collections but eventually settling squarely into OCT I, ascends registrally until the climax beginning in measure 61 when the piano recalls the entrance of movement I’s P-zone. OCT I prevails as the section comes to a close over the prolonged F# in the bass.

Example 4.9 shows the C’ section (measures 65-72) and the corrupted return of theme D. There will only be one statement of the theme this time, but it is irrevocably changed. The harmonics and melody itself have been transposed by fifth, so the melody is G-centric (G major-minor-dorian?). The piano’s F# from measure 64 would move down by half step to F if this section were to transpose the bass as well as the melody for the reprise, but instead, we hear an oscillating French augmented-sixth construction, B♭-E-D-G#, in triplets. The effect is unsettling, to say the least. It seems that the onslaught of octatonicism from the developmental section, coupled with the token themes and motives representing the war and movement I, have corrupted the pastoral ideal. A return to pre-War naïveté, where F# resolves to F and a sonorous folk melody closes the movement, is impossible. In regard to the war’s effects on literature, Fussell writes, “For the modern imagination that last summer [pre-War] has assumed the status of a permanent symbol for anything innocently but irrevocably lost. Transferred meanings of ‘our summer of 1914’ retain the irony of the original, for the change from felicity to despair, pastoral
Example 4.9: II, measures 65-72, featuring the transposed reprise of theme D over a Fr+6 accompaniment (violin harmonics: D5-G5-D5-A5; cello harmonics: G4-D4-A4-D4)
to anti-pastoral, is melodramatically unexpected. And indeed, the shift toward despair at theme D’s return, accompanied entirely by antagonistic tritones, increases in the final moments of the movement.

Measures 72-74 are a transposed but almost exact return of the material from measures 7-8, with the cello taking the melody previously allocated to violin and transposing it down a major second. It is here that the significance of measures 7-8 becomes clear. The two passages are shown in Example 4.10.

Example 4.10: II, measures 7-9 (above) and 72-75 (below), showing fragments of theme D

---

In mm. 72-73, the moving line in the left hand of the piano bears an eerie similarity to the opening gesture of theme D, except it is entirely chromaticized. The octatonic chords that originally accompanied it are still in place, albeit transposed down by step, in a prolongation of the Fr+6 from its second appearance. That same left-hand melody in measures 72-73 appeared in rhythmic augmentation in the inner voice in measure 7, and was therefore disguised. The piano’s chromatic version of the opening of theme D, plus the violin’s descending pseudo-pentatonic melody and the cello’s descent in measure 8, all combine to essentially form the entire central theme of the movement. After hearing the nostalgic, modal version in the middle of the movement, the distorted version at the end is suddenly recognizable. Compare the cello in measure 8 and the inner voice of the piano in measure 74 with measures 39 and 67 in the piano (Example 4.11).

Example 4.11: II, measures 8, (above), 39 (left), 67 (center), 74 (right), showing recurring fragment of theme D from introit to ending.

Bringing back the earlier, then-uncontextualized introit material at this moment brings the reality of theme D to the fore. It was already there in its fragmented, chromatic, corrupted, octatonicized form before the movement began (suggesting that this music occurs post-War). It was the
military themes, indicative of the recent war-torn past, which triggered the memory of the truly unattainable pre-War pastoral. From here forward, only the dissonant version remains.

The return of the opening introit material continues the movement’s trend of unconvincing cadences. Theme D’s reprise attempted a cadence in measure 72 but lacked the harmonic support to do so. As the fragmented melodic material leads into the violin introit, a stepwise descending bass from B♭ down to G is met with right hand melodic motion reminiscent of a Landini cadence, lending an ancient, otherworldly air to the haunting melody with which it elides. The violin line is expanded by one measure this time, where the melody rises up through C♯-D♯-E to F♯ over a G-D pedal. This ascent stems from an A♯ in measure 79, altered from an A in its first appearance in measure 5, which fleshes out the OCT I collection and removes the scalar obscurity that previously plagued the introduction. The OCT ascent is heavily marked with hairpin dynamics, rubato, a Sul D indication, and a grand pause, all serving to highlight the many harsh dissonances over the G-D pedal point. Whereas the acute dissonance at the end of the first movement was the product of melodic resignation, this one seems brought about by strained defiance and resistance—an attempt to move on, perhaps?—only to be brought back down to a consonant, albeit disappointing, ending.

The melody recoils into G/D modal subservience to a ppp conclusion with D in the violin over G major triads. The cadence in measure 82 never happened in the introit, as it was met with the “near-Mystic Chord” in measure 7 and led into the ostinato. At its final appearance, we can now see yet another connection between this bookending material and the central theme D: the final cadence closely approximates its melodic closure (Example 4.12). Compare measure 44, where the final is approached by descending step, and measure 82, where the same melodic close is met with a G major triad. Despite its apparent consonance and quasi-cadence into measure 82,
Example 4.12: II, measures 40-44 (above) and 79-84 (below), showing similar melodic cadence of theme D in piano and violin, respectively.
there is much about this resolution that feels unsettled. The melodic close on D is not met with D major or minor triads, but with G major. While consonant, it recalls the corruption of the central theme to $G_{Fr+6}$-dorian from its pure D-centric iteration. Additionally, and immediately preceding, there is the telltale dissonant upward expansion of the melody to its high point, emphasizing rupture and disjunction in the same way as the first movement.

In the first movement of the Trio, we were in the midst of the Great War, with machine guns firing and aggressive octatonicism pervading. The few moments of recollection of the past, represented with diatonic and triadic modality, occurred at the triadic sound of a bugle over a maximally dissonant pedal point, corrupting the tune used to honor the dead into an octatonic subset. The coda begins with the bugle call, expressively transforming the bombastic opening fanfare into an elegy. At its fatigued end, the octatonic M motive is paired with a whole-tone, exhausted sighing gesture in the cello, and the two pitch collections associated with “new” music of the twentieth-century were united by an augmented-sixth construction comprised of their common tones. The second movement’s opening is defined by indeterminacy. Which collection should be explored: the modality of the past, or the OCT and WT of the present? The initially vexing fragments of tunes coalesce into octatonicism and reach an initial boiling point. The distant memory of gunfire erases the octatonic and whole-tone corruption of the previously fragmented melody, condensing it into one cantabile line in the piano, bringing it back to its dorian purity. The reverie is interrupted by even purer octatonicism as signature motives from both movements interact, and the original, pristine memory of the tune is impossible to regain. It appears again, more sinister, and eventually returns to its original piecemeal, fragmented state. Perhaps, like the trends in literature and theater, Rebecca Clarke was moving toward an ironic portrayal of England’s naïve innocence of the past. Or, perhaps this is a bleaker view of what
England and its music looks like going forward. In Guy Chapman’s memoir of trench warfare, he writes of he and his fellow comrades rushing to repair damage from shell fire, when a young voice singing a folk song emerged from the mist singing,

…some Dorian-moded folksong. High and high it rose, echoing and filling the mist, pure, too pure for this draggled hill-side. We stopped our work to listen. No one would have dared break the fragile echo. As we listened, the fog shifted a little, swayed and began to melt. We collected our tools and bundled back to our trench. The singing voice drew further off, as if it was only an emanation of the drifting void. The sun came out and the familiar field of dirty green with his hedges of wire and pickets rose to view, empty of life.¹⁶

This memoir excerpt seems a dramatization of Clarke’s second movement, in which an Arcadian tune materializes amid despair and destruction. When it fades, the surroundings seem bleaker than before, and the entire landscape has irreparably changed. The finale will attempt to move past the corruptive events as hints of memorable themes return in an excessively jovial guise, only to be confronted with the brutality of the past.

The ebullient themes that emerge in movement III gradually give way to and interact with thematic material from the earlier movements, including M, B, fragments of the S-theme, and the movement II ostinato. Motive M gradually becomes more powerful and leads to a full-scale, at-pitch return of the first movement’s opening fanfare and coda (measures 150-181), separated by an extended bugle call over OCT arpeggiations. Return of earlier thematic material is the point of a cyclic sonata, but to saturate the whole movement with an assemblage of earlier themes and then drop in an exact restatement of a large swath of musical material from the first movement is exceptional. Perhaps this thematic return will initiate an attempt to “write over” the corruption of themes from earlier, or perhaps it will initiate true closure, something sorely lacking and, seemingly, purposefully eschewed up to this point. Instead, the interplay and relationship

between recycled material and the two dance tunes seem to represent an attempt to move forward while constantly being confronted with past trauma.

The *allegro vigoroso* begins with a *martellato*, seemingly carefree, dance-like theme (Example 4.13).

Example 4.13: III, measures 1-8, theme J in piano; turn figure in measure 8 will be developed in 13-25.
However, it is ushered in with quadruple stops in both the cello and violin, outlining dissonant perfect fifths that have haunted the composition thus far. From bass to the top note, we hear E♭-B♭, G-D, A-E. The first dyad recalls the ending of the first movement, when it was the intended final, but undermined by the violin’s A♭. G-D recalls the tonal struggle in movement II, which ended with D in the violin over a G-major triad after hearing theme D in both D_C/G-dorian and G_{FR+6}-dorian. A-E corresponds to the apparent tonal center of this opening theme (in A-dorian), but also to A’s role as a “tonal obscurer” in movement I and in the finale.

This jaunty theme (theme J) has a past. The first six notes follow the same intervallic pattern as the M theme from the P-zone of movement I (and therefore recalls the ostinato from movement II). The C♯/C♮ contrast echoes the B/B♭ modal contrast from movement II’s introit theme. And finally, the figure in measure 7 is the same descending figure (at pitch!) we saw in the second half of theme D (compare with II, measure 39), which also had its roots in modal material from the first movement. This seemingly blithe dance is burdened with references to the past. The pitch collections, starting off as essentially A-dorian, eventually veer off and alternate between octatonic and whole tone. Theme J is whittled down to an obsessive whole-tone subset turn-figure motive, and the next section focuses on this whole-tone emphasis in the strings (measures 13-25), while scherzando half-step clashes, evoking octatonicism, accompany in the piano. Measure 25 ends the section with a spritely little cadence and caesura, when another modal dance tune is introduced.

This seemingly new tune is actually not so new. It is the opening of the movement recast in a heavy, plodding guise, and features the descending motivic figures heard in all other modal tunes. The accented melody over open fifths evokes a musette type of dance, but in this context, it feels quite forced.
Measures 53-92 also recall several themes from earlier in the Trio, including B, the S-theme, and the second movement ostinato. Whole-tone and octatonic collections are layered atop one another, and the bugle enters canonically in all voices in two different keys a half step apart. For example, measures 59-60 show the bugle in E♭ in the piano answered by the same motive in D in the violin. The half-step clashes have been a compositional motive throughout the work, first seen in the S-theme in movement I (B♭ against a B♭-centric theme) and occupying a large section of this movement as well due to canon at the half step. The S-theme is given the same D against E♭ treatment (measures 64-74), eventually settling into a full OCT II presentation. What was formerly a modal symbol of the past has now been tainted and affected by octatonicism. When the S-theme is restated beginning in measure 73, the piano’s four-note chords, formerly triadic in the first movement, are now dissonant with ninths between the bass and soprano, causing the section to grow increasingly unstable. Before the return of the opening of the movement, there is a hypnotic passage featuring the first six notes of the S-theme in OCT II (measures 85-91) that is undeniably reminiscent of Twilight Zone theme music to our modern ears.

After a reprise of the third movement’s opening jig (measures 92-148), a foreboding bell toll interrupts the relentless whole-tone turn figure (measure 129). The bell is actually theme M in the piano, spanning four octaves and rhythmically augmented to plodding quarter notes marked maestoso. Motive M sounds like a harbinger of doom as the string melodies, quiet and fast-paced, scurry out of sight. Indeed, this premonition is confirmed when the entire opening fanfare reappears at pitch in measure 150. The devastating return of the Trio’s introduction is only altered in one way: an extended bugle call in A major rings insistently beneath an OCT I
piano arpeggio (measures 158-161). After a sffz attack, the bugle appears again in F major in the depths of the piano, and the entirety of movement I’s coda appears at pitch.

This is a fairly shocking turn of events in the course of this sonata. A sizeable amount of material from the first movement (32 measures) was abruptly inserted in the finale, uncontextualized. Both segments were introduced by familiar motives that had taken on entirely different characters as well. The rapid-fire machine gun became a lumbering bell toll. The distant, plaintive bugle call is heard here as a persistent, obnoxious, deafening threat. By juxtaposing the beginning and ending of the first movement side by side, Clarke has created something akin to a musical flashbulb memory. We, and our presumed protagonist, at once remember all the events of the first movement. It is inescapable, much like how someone who has been through a traumatic event can be unwillingly thrust right back into it, as if it were yesterday. In movement III, the supposedly carefree, modally-inspired dance is plagued by all the events that came before it, its joviality accompanied and interrupted by trauma at any given time.

As the music makes its way through the elegiac coda for the second time, a breathtaking sonority is heard in measure 171 (Example 4.14). It also appeared in movement I, but the violin did not participate and the spacing was quite different. C-E (and F♯)-F♯-B♭-E♭ breaks the previous OCT III collection and returns to OCT I, the original “tonic collection” of the entire work. The violin on F♯6 against the cello’s E♭5 is piercing and harrowing despite the piano dynamic marking. This chord’s dramatic registral alteration marks it as a locus for an ensuing dramatic transformation, with the power to drive the finale toward convincing harmonic and structural closure. Instead, the coda continues identically to its first manifestation, making the violin’s

---

17 The stark minor ninth also recalls the piano’s octatonic interjections during the attempted string chorale in the transitional section of movement II.
ensuing fatigued motive M and sighing cello seem even more labored. As before, the strings repeat melodic subsets from WT 0 and OCT I while the piano connects the disparate collections with their French augmented-sixth construction common tones. The final chance to achieve structural closure waits at the point where the violin previously collapsed by half step.

At the previous cadence point in movement I (measure 188), the violin descended to A against the E♭-B♭ dyad. In the corresponding moment in movement III, measure 182, there is the chance to rewrite the events that followed the first movement’s cadence. Instead, Clarke writes a
variant of the exact same idea. That is, the collection of perfect fifths dyads from the beginning of movement III reappear, but in a different guise (Example 4.15).

Example 4.15: III, measures 177-185, “cadence point” from I (measure 181) met with lontano dance theme

The simultaneity—including G-D in violin, E♭-B♭ in cello, and what was A-E in the first measure—is here recast as the outline of the third movement’s dance theme. It is marked lontano and ppp, much like the harbingers of memory were throughout the composition. The modal dance theme returns marked as a wistful, distant memory of British modal purity and innocence. As is to be expected, this moment of repose cannot last. The A-centric theme is answered by an
E♭-A tritone in the piano and the movement ends as it began. There is no resolution to the opening sonority in the strings and its unsettled past. The crazed dance obsesses over its whole-tone turn figure, repeated obsessively on E♭/D♯, as the strings play triple and quadruple stops on triads a tritone apart from one another. After oscillating between OCT and WT collections, all voices descend in canon in WT 1 until the final unconvincingly cheerful E♭ major ending. The approach to the final triad is, unsurprisingly at this point, approached by tritone in the bass (A-E♭), melodically restating the final sonority in the first movement. Only the alternative pitch collections rife with ambiguity remain in this post-War world. Pre-War British folksong modality is no longer an option; it will forever be tainted. After the unexpected death of eight million people, that simpler time only exists as a memory.
CHAPTER FIVE: ANTI-NARRATIVE IN FRANK BRIDGE’S STRING QUARTET NO. 3

Yet one important element in his highly practical musicianship had been almost eliminated [in the 1920s]—his hitherto precise regard for an audience’s capacity to be abreast of whatever he was offering them…Almost without warning he issued not the old easy invitation but a disconcertingly new and unpredictable challenge. No one expected it of him.1

Frank Bridge (1879-1941) wrote four string quartets over the course of his life, with each one serving as a representative of his distinct compositional periods. He composed his String Quartet No. 3 during the years of 1924-1927, directly after completion of his Piano Sonata. This dense foray into modernism and expressionism using post-tonal language was the start of a new direction for Bridge, who had previously composed works that were accessible and pleasing to early twentieth-century British musicians and audiences. Thanks to the annual financial support from his patron and this work’s dedicatee, Elizabeth Sprague Coolidge, Bridge was able to stop performing as a violist and focus on substantial works of musical modernism, a reaction to the growing trend of expressionism on the continent. Bridge scholars such as Anthony Payne, Fabian Huss, and Bryan L. Wade contend that the composer adhered to recognizable formal designs in order to convey to audiences a modicum of familiarity in the murky, post-tonal landscape. While accurate to some extent, I will demonstrate that the String Quartet No. 3 actually loosens its hold on formal norms of construction as it progresses. This slide into formal ambiguity, coupled with pervasive thematic recurrence that sets up an expectation of transformation but does not ultimately deliver, establishes an “anti-narrative” over the course of its three movements, or an upending of common-practice period narrative constraints.

It seems that Frank Bridge did not feel beholden to the ideals of the English Musical Renaissance. In an interview for Musical America in 1923, he said, “You really cannot speak of

---

nationality in music, since art is worldwide. If there is to be any expression of national spirit, it must be the expression of the composer’s own thoughts and feelings, and it must come from the promptings of his own inspiration; he cannot seek it, and any effort on his part to aim at it as a national expression must end in failure.”2 The emphasis on the subjective and personal in Bridge’s quote is telling. Despite the trend of nationalism and looking inward for inspiration in his home country, Bridge’s compositional source was himself and his own thoughts and emotions. The expressive possibilities in the musical developments in France, Germany, and Austria were, to him, greater than what a focus on British folk song and Tudor melodies could afford him, at least in his post-War works of the 1920s. Huss notes, “Bridge’s formalist inclinations and cosmopolitan outlook suggest that he had little or no interest in working within a specifically national context, focusing instead on purely musical matters.”3 One hears more in common with the Second Viennese School and Scriabin in the third Quartet than anything by his fellow British composers.

As he matured, Bridge also had little or no interest in continuing to perform in order to make ends meet. Performers were often held in low esteem in early twentieth-century England, and both Frank Bridge and his wife Ethel hoped he could give up that part of his musical life entirely and focus on composing and conducting. Thankfully, at a tea party in 1922, the Bridges met Elizabeth Sprague Coolidge, an American who decided to pursue musical patronage after inheriting money from both her parents and late husband.4 The financial security this patronage afforded him was life changing, and certainly contributed directly to the advancements in his style. Now able to leave behind low-profile engagements, he could focus entirely on composition.

---

4 Ibid., 153.
with little care for how his new works would be received. In fact, the development of his progressive, post-tonal style did not sit well with the conservative audiences in England, and Bridge received several negative reviews in the press. With Coolidge championing his works, finding ways to premiere new compositions was not an issue despite this negative feedback, and she arranged performances for him both in his home country and abroad.\(^5\)

It is telling that a drop-off in Bridge’s compositional output coincided with his newfound financial security; the composer had worked with elements of what would be his new style in miniature before, but struggled with utilizing expressionist language over large-scale structures. The Piano Sonata and String Quartet No. 3 were the only works completed over the course of six years, but once he felt comfortable with this new style, his output greatly increased over the rest of his life. The support of Coolidge allowed him the luxury of taking the time to grapple with issues of balancing variety and uniformity over thirty minutes of music. Huss writes,

Bridge’s development of a dissonant, post-tonal language, unlike any found in Britain during his lifetime, reveals his ongoing fascination with vividness of expression, providing an idiom within which strong contrasts, striking gestural content and a varied harmonic and motivic surface could be integrated into a substantial structural scheme validated by tradition and formalist aesthetics.\(^6\)

The last part of that quotation is crucial: in Bridge’s expressionism, traditional forms still apply, but the surface themes, motives, and harmonies are jarring.

To date, two scholarly works attempt to uncover these traditional forms and how they interact with Bridge’s modernist approach to harmonic and thematic transformation. Bryan L. Wade’s 1995 dissertation, “The Four String Quartets of Frank Bridge,” provides a detailed analysis of all four quartets with considerations of form, thematic content, harmony, and tonality.

\(^5\) A biographical history is not in keeping with the scope of this dissertation. However, Fabian Huss’s 2015 book, *The Music of Frank Bridge*, provides ample reading on Bridge’s personal and professional life, his compositional development, and relationship with Elizabeth Sprague Coolidge.

\(^6\) Huss, *The Music of Frank Bridge*, 129.
Wade divides Bridge’s compositional history into four style periods, with one quartet emerging from each: the Edwardian period (1904-1912), a prolific time that produced seventy works with a focus on melody and featuring a harmonically conservative idiom; the transitional period (1913-1924), during which time he expanded his musical language, possibly as a by-product of World War I and its effects on himself as a well-documented pacifist; the progressive period (1924-1932), from whence the third Quartet emerges, when Bridge begins to explore other styles and techniques thanks to Viennese expressionism and the financial support from Coolidge; and a “Classical” style (1933-1941), featuring strict adherence to traditional forms and musical conciseness.  

Peter J. Pirie observes, “In these works can be seen an almost isolated example of music that is transitional between conventional English music of the 1930’s and the magnificent radical works of Peter Maxwell Davies, Harrison Birtwistle, and Brian Ferneyhough.” As Bridge’s language moves away from tonality, Wade’s theoretical lenses shift from conventional Schenkerian sketches to looser, schematic sketches demonstrating structural bass motions, and finally to set theory for the fourth Quartet. He also takes great care in pointing out referential chord types that Bridge uses as de facto cadential punctuation (labeled “Bridge chords,” hereafter referred to as B.c.), demonstrating thematic evolution from smaller motivic ideas presented in the opening section of the work.

The result is a comprehensive analysis of nearly every measure of all the string quartets, which is helpful in establishing a formal framework and illuminating the interrelatedness of prominent themes and motives throughout. At the same time, his essentially taxonomic approach to the analysis fails to explore the hermeneutic implications of the global formal and thematic design of the piece.

---

7 Bryan L. Wade, “The Four String Quartets of Frank Bridge,” (PhD diss., Catholic University of America, 1995), 4-5.
Fabian Huss’s recently published book, *The Music of Frank Bridge*, examines the composer’s life and compositional development supported by mostly brief analyses of representative compositions from each style period (the second movement of String Quartet No. 3 occupies one paragraph, for instance). The book grew out of his 2011 dissertation, “The Chamber Music of Frank Bridge,” but does not limit itself to chamber music. Huss nicely contextualizes Bridge’s music within personal, aesthetic, and socio-cultural contexts, providing a holistic overview of the chosen compositions and how they coincided with Bridge’s personal circumstances and worldview. He largely keeps to Wade’s style-period distinctions, but interestingly cordons off the years 1921-1927 as their own entity, “Bridge’s Post-Tonal Idiom.” Up to that point, the transitional period demonstrated an expansion of tonal language more in line with Debussyan impressionism, while still adhering to traditional formal constructs.

Huss dedicates a subchapter to characteristics of Bridge’s post-tonal language, and asserts that in the absence of traditional tonality, Bridge uses prioritized pitches or pitch collections as referential signposts. The composer juxtaposes these referential pitches and sonorities, linked with certain motives, against unstable contrasting material that often makes use of symmetrical pitch collections such as whole-tone and octatonic scales. While he occasionally uses WT and OCT collections in their pure form, more often he alters them by adding or removing pitches. The frequent triad and seventh-chord constructions are typically subsets of WT and OCT, and the altered forms of these scales can easily sound like melodic minor scales and dominant-seventh chords, although these do not behave functionally. In regard to his employment of “near” WT and OCT collections, Huss writes, “Thus Bridge can use large ‘almost octatonic’ collections

---

*Fabian Huss, “The Chamber Music of Frank Bridge,” (PhD diss., University of Bristol, 2010).*
to suggest both relative stability or instability.\textsuperscript{10} Huss also mentions Bridge chords and the appearance of all-interval tetrachords, although the latter are used more in the late works.\textsuperscript{11}

Insightful as it is, the above summary highlights potential analytical issues one might encounter with Huss’s guide: recognizable pitch collections may be altered so as to become less recognizable, or they can exist in a pure form; these collections can be used to signify both stability \textit{and} instability; all the subsets from these collections—triads, dominant sevenths, altered dominants, augmented sixths, fully-diminished seventh chords, etc.—comprise most chord constructions in use throughout music history. What, then, constitutes Bridge’s “post-tonal harmonic language? From Huss’s account, it appears that this is difficult to pinpoint, can vary wildly from moment to moment, and is comprised of most collections and their subsets utilized in western composition. Without further qualification or specificity, this description of Bridge’s “post-tonal idiom” represents too general a model for his pitch language and its use in his music. Accordingly, a narrative-structural approach can provide context for themes and their pitch content, taking into consideration factors such as the relative purity of collections as well as notions of relative consonance and dissonance.

What Wade, Huss, and Anthony Payne agree on, however, is that Bridge maintains traditional formal designs despite unpredictable, bombastic surface events. Conformance to common-practice structural designs implies basic adherence of the music under investigation to specific, relevant, contextually-defined expectations on the part of the analyst, forming the basis of a musical plot.\textsuperscript{12} The idea of a musical plot is fertile ground for narrative implications, as plot

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{10} Huss, \textit{The Music of Frank Bridge}, 136.
\textsuperscript{11} Ibid., 134-139.
\textsuperscript{12} The idea of “plot” and its adaptation within music analysis occupies a quite large and important area of research in musical narrative. Chapter two’s broad overview of the narrative subfield introduces several scholars and their work regarding narrative and plot, but the work of Fred Everette Maus, Nicholas Reyland, and Seth Monahan, among others, explores this topic in great detail. My analysis in this chapter, particularly regarding the notion of transvaluation, is informed by Byron Almén’s \textit{A Theory of Musical Narrative} (Indiana: Indiana University Press,
\end{flushleft}
generally demonstrates some sort of change over time and leads to a shift in the music’s ranking of values, or transvaluation. For instance, one can assume that a sonata form exposition will present at least two thematic groupings in at least two different keys, establishing conflict that presumably will be reconciled at the end of the recapitulation. The road to tonal concord will likely be fraught with peril, but the primary tonal area will likely be the victor and there will be a sense of tonal closure. Such a plot would adhere to Frye’s (and therefore, Almén’s and Klein’s) category of a romantic narrative: the victory of order over a transgressor.

In the absence of tonality, methods of narrative analysis become more dependent on individual context. In Klein’s *Music and Narrative since 1900*, he reconfigures the Greimasian square used for tonal music to accommodate the changing musical language in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries. The original and reconfigured maps are shown in Example 5.1. The traditional comic, ironic, romantic, and tragic points around the narrative map have additional labels for this new sound world. Narrative pertains to music that generally adheres to harmonic and thematic practices from the nineteenth century, music that is unequivocally narrative in scope. Non-narrative music is “…just a set of independent sound worlds, textures, or blips of acoustic matter,” music that does not adhere to organizational constraints.\(^{13}\) New narrative discourse, neo-narrative on this map, finds new ways to tell musical stories that are a direct byproduct of the advantages and challenges presented by the move away from tonality. Anti-narrative is essentially a critique of narrative, in which composers “take on the conventions of musical narrative discourse in order to deny our expectations for their continuation.”\(^ {14}\)

---

\(^{13}\) Ibid., 5.

\(^{14}\) Ibid., 6.

Example 5.1: Frye’s narrative categories (left)\(^5\) Klein’s post-1900 map of narrative discourse (right)\(^6\)


crucial to remember that music does not solely occupy one point on the square for its entire
duration, but is constantly shifting along with our expectations as the discourse unfolds in time.
The left side of the map upholds narrative discourse (labeled CONFIRM), while the right
questions or outright rejects narrative (labeled DENY). Klein orients the map with neo- and anti-
narrative at the top because most music from the twentieth century questions and/or refashions
the narrative methods from the common-practice period (meta-narrative).

Both Huss and, more explicitly, Wade point to strict adherence to sonata and ternary
forms in the third Quartet and a general shift from instability towards stability as evidenced by
thematic development, transformation, and harmonic grounding. My analysis will show that
Bridge lays all the groundwork for a traditional formal and teleological narrative, even within a
post-tonal musical language; but the grasp on formal norms gradually loosens over the course of
the three movements, leading to the disintegration of formal construction in the finale and an
ending in which no sense of resolution is ultimately achieved.

The first movement is a fairly standard sonata-arch form, with a nine-measure slow
introduction that introduces many of the motives and themes encountered across the Quartet
(Example 5.2). For Bridge, much of the intervallic content here will spur on nearly all of the
tightly related themes that emerge during the work. The tritone that opens the movement, as well
as its symmetrical division into minor thirds, governs many of the melodic themes and harmonic
underpinnings across all three movements, along with the half step and its immediately
juxtaposed inversion of a major seventh. Violin II features a descending motive comprised of
half steps and both major and minor thirds, an almost complete hexatonic collection. Noting that
types of seconds, thirds, sevenths, and augmented fourths are all present may seem trivial, but
there is a conspicuous lack of perfect consonances and sixths. Additionally, the contour of
melodic lines is an important thematic consideration, as melodies will often contrast a stepwise passage with an ascent of a wide leap, and will often descend via use of major or minor thirds throughout. The accompanimental, syncopated figure in the inner voices in measures 5-7 serves as a textural respite from the oppressive counterpoint that comprises the bulk of the work, but is actually a verticalized intensification of violin I’s primary intervallic content in the opening five measures: a tritone, minor second, and major seventh. Measure 5 contains a C♯ in viola, with G and F♯ in violin II, a trichord featuring a tritone between the lower notes and a major seventh between the upper two. The same intervallic construction is found in measure 6, which contains A♭-D♭-G. Motivic intervals are typically found in both melodic and harmonic presentations.
Throughout the work, and will be explored in depth during the discussion of the second movement. Also of note are the detailed expression and dynamic markings in the slow introduction. The ascending tritone is labeled both espressivo (measures 1 and 5) and dolce (upbeat to measure 8), creating an overarching expressive hairpin crescendo to measure 5 followed by a decrescendo to measure 9. Every melodic utterance is literally marked in some way by the composer. The dynamics are listed with precision, particularly the rapid p-f-p hairpin in measures 1-2, a nod to the score styles of the German expressionists.17

The next nine measures give the impression of the start of the primary zone, but they more accurately represent a kind of “motive juggling” before the sonata form can begin in earnest. They serve a crucial purpose, however, in introducing several Bridge chords (B.c.) and a motive that will recur throughout the entire composition with little to no alteration. Wade identifies three distinct B.c.’s while Huss only mentions one. I believe it is important to recognize two types of Bridge chords, shown in Example 5.3. B.c.1 is a minor triad with a major triad stacked on top, the roots of which are a whole step apart. This chord is almost always presented in a polychordal layout, with the minor triad on the bottom and the major above it. B.c.2 represents a tonic minor triad presented simultaneously with its major dominant, with which it shares a chord tone (for instance, E minor and B major, with B shared between them). The third chord appears as an augmented triad with a minor third on top, or an augmented major seventh chord, but is technically a subset of B.c. 2.18

17 In addition to the detailed expression markings, the texture of the introduction and its proliferation of Viennese trichords [016] could be seen as another reference, or perhaps imitation, of the German expressionists. Huss notes that it is more likely that Scriabin was Bridge’s primary influence during his exploration of the post-tonal idiom, but it is entirely possible that he was familiar with the works of the Second Viennese School.
Example 5.3: Bridge chords 1, 2, and 3. The asterisk denotes the chord described by both Huss and Wade.

The primary motives are shown in Example 5.4.

Motive X is the violin’s opening melody from the introduction, and contains two distinct intervallic units: an initial tritone and ascending half step, followed by descending half step and ascending seventh leap. The two intervallic groupings will appear either separately or together as the material is developed.

Motive Y initially appears in measures 3-4 in violin II, and is a descending hexatonic subset comprised of only half steps and minor thirds. Its variants are comprised of seconds and thirds, but the specific interval and the order of their presentation varies. In measure 20, violin I descends through two half steps and a minor third, and the next variant, seen in measure 21,
features two interlocking minor thirds. The most identifiable and recurrent motive throughout the Quartet makes its first appearance in this motive-juggling section as well. Motive Z germinates in the cello in measure 12, but appears in its characteristic rhythm in measure 17. It incorporates almost all of the intervalllic content seen in measures 1-9: minor third up, major third up, and a descending half step that creates a tritone from the first note. Motive Z almost always appears in this exact rhythm, and most often on the pitches C-E♭-G-F♯, setting up an opposition between C and F♯ at the outset. The ordering of this four-note motive establishes it as a potentially multivalent agent. The ascending minor triad connotes a tonal linchpin, or perhaps eventual tonal or pitch center, with the F♯ representing a lower neighbor to C minor’s scale degree 5. It can also be seen as an elaboration of the tritone, in which the G is perceived as an upper neighbor to the F♯. This would relate to the opening violin I tritone that began the work, and works nicely to emphasize a post-tonal symmetrical division of the octave. These four notes are also a subset of B.c. 1, meaning Bridge will present this motive in both melodic and harmonic contexts.

The sonata-arch form proceeds in a fairly standard fashion, with all of the previously mentioned motives interacting contrapuntally (Example 5.5). The primary zone lasts from measures 19-51, and gradually shifts emphasis from a dense network of melodies derived largely from Y and Y’ to a saturation of Z and X. With the marcato entrance of Z in measure 28, the Y-derived melodies fragment and fade away. Their absence makes room for simultaneous X- and Z-related motives to take over and lead to a mini-peak of the primary zone material from measures 31-38. After a gradual descent, the texture thins and dissolves. The transition material begins in measure 52, an ascending line of parallel first-inversion major triads in three voices with a cantus-firmus style line in the viola that outlines a melodic major triad of its own.

Contrary to typical sonata-form transitions, which are often forceful, energetic explosions that
launch the work into tonal instability, this transition does the polar opposite. That is, Bridge sets up his sonata first movement in a markedly unexpected way. The P-zone material is jarring, dense, chromatic, contrapuntal, and rather lengthy, while the Tr-zone is very brief, dolce, homophonic, and serene. The Tr-material appears twice, transposed by tritone the second time (measure 60), and is interrupted by interjections of Y and X, both marked espressivo. It is not unusual to have Tr material based on P-zone motives; however, here the P-zone motives serve as an unwelcome and dissonant interruption of the otherworldly Tr theme.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Motives/Themes</th>
<th>Expressive Content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-9</td>
<td>Slow introduction</td>
<td>X (vln I, vcl); Y (vln II, vcl [variant])</td>
<td>Espressivo, heavily marked dynamics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-18</td>
<td>“Motive juggling”</td>
<td>X, X (frag.), Y (frag.), Z (vcl m. 17)</td>
<td>Energico</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-51</td>
<td>P-zone</td>
<td>X, Y, and Z</td>
<td>Appassionato, energico, dolce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52-64</td>
<td>Tr</td>
<td>ascending, homophonic theme, X interrupts</td>
<td>Tranquillo, dolce, pp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-99</td>
<td>S-zone</td>
<td>S-theme, romantic theme with blurry accompaniment; first in vla then vln I; motive X appears</td>
<td>Dolce, legato. X marked as risoluto, vla reaction agitato. Second statement poco a poco animato</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100-106</td>
<td>Tr’ repurposed as Cl</td>
<td>Reprise to usher in development; dissipates with Y and Z in vla, B.c. in other vcs.</td>
<td>Dolcissimo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Example 5.5: Exposition form chart**

As the song-like S-theme begins (measure 65), a surprisingly lyrical melody first presented in the viola with an oscillating accompaniment, we are under the impression that this is “S-zone business as usual”: a cantabile, singable theme that directly contrasts with the traditionally harsh nature of P (Example 5.6). Despite its expressive contrast, this theme is still linked to the P-zone, and its identifiable characteristics are cast in a more lyrical light. Melodic tritones are emphasized at the beginnings and endings of phrases, softened by an initial half step
ascent and forming an [016] trichord (measures 67-68 ascending, 69-70 descending, 71-72 ascending). The descending figure in measures 69-70 recalls the initial descent of theme Y from the introduction as well. In measure 72, this yearning melody is rudely interrupted by a *risoluto* cello exclamation of X from the introduction and P-zone, an unusual occurrence in the S-zone of a sonata. In conventional sonata forms, themes from the P- and S-zones generally do not interact until the development section; here the viola recoils with an *agitato* response. Violin I picks up the melody for a second attempt at measure 77, this time given more harmonic support due to the addition of arpeggiated triads in the viola, but the tritone keeps ominously interrupting in measures 81 and 83. The melody ascends to an *appassionato* climax (measure 84) in the upper register in a truly remarkable moment, with a wonderfully resonant C-major triad thanks to the open C string in the cello. The melody ends on F# in a quasi-tonal fashion thanks to the approach from C# on the upbeat to measure 88. The harmonic support does not contribute to this sense of closure, as it is underpinned by B, G, and an arpeggiation of E\textsubscript{b}-C\textsubscript{#}-A. That said, the notes C-C\#-F\# in measures 87-88 seem to correlate to the tritone/ascending half step ([016]) established by the P-zone’s motive X, as previously mentioned. That said, this melodic fragment’s specific pitch classes point to a broader emphasis on F# and C as tonal pillars, a potentiality also displayed by motive Z, and unfolds in the following measures. The marked C major bass line harmonization in measure 84 progresses by tritone to F# in measure 85, answered melodically and registrally with the F#6 in measure 88. The latter half of the melody is transposed and heard once more in violin I, this time melodically cadencing on B in measure 95 but only after a nearly isolated C-F# is heard in the viola. Motives X and Z sneak in once more before the Tr material returns (measure 100), signaling the end of the exposition and ushering in the development. The hold F# has on the final moments of the exposition should be loosened in the recapitulation, as
secondary material often returns transposed. Instead, this specific pitch class will continue to control the melodic and harmonic motion of the rest of the movement and the composition as a whole.

The lengthy development spans measures 104-200, and contains a false recapitulation of both P and S (Example 5.7). As expected, it is largely a battleground for all previous themes and motives to interact, but features some new material as well. The new material, especially the melody presented in measures 115-121, is similar in intervallic content to all the previous material, exploiting half steps, minor and major thirds, and tritones. Beginning in measure 135, a cello ostinato is also brought to the forefront, rife with half-step motion and large leaps reminiscent of X. These two ideas grow in prominence eventually giving way to the “motive Z takeover” that prevails for the next thirty measures, leading to the first false recap in measure 181. Here, motives X and Z are layered, leading to the descending Y motive and an espressivo cello exclamation of the familiar opening tritone (measure 186), transposed down an octave from its original presentation. This leads into the S-theme, still stated in the cello, with the syncopated accompanimental chords last heard in measures 5-7. The texture is interrupted with motive X in measure 196, and S returns in its familiar guise for the true start of the recapitulation in measure 201. The effect of two false recapitulations serves to distract listeners from the overarching formal construction of this movement. By presenting motive X followed by the S-theme, a listener in real time will assume that the recapitulation will be presented in the standard beginning to ending fashion. As noted, this movement is actually in sonata arch form, where the S material returns prior to the P material, a less common structural approach. Regardless, these false recapitulations serve to discombobulate the listener by jumbling the assumed or expected linear unfolding of a first movement sonata form.
Example 5.6: I, measures 65-72, S-theme in viola
In measure 201, the S-theme theme is transposed up a half step, allowing for the appassionato resonant triad to emerge over a D♭ major bass arpeggiation. The rest of the recapitulation returns in reverse in near verbatim to its appearance in the exposition, with the exception of a few brief melodic expansions. The coda, spanning measures 256-265, gets an energetic push three measures earlier thanks to a con fuoco, rhythmically diminished exclamation of the opening two measures punctuated by Bridge chords and motive Z, which takes over the entire ending (Example 5.8). Z furiously repeats in the cello as the upper voices scream measures 19-20 in unison, until they are all overtaken by motive Z in its original form, containing both C and F#. A six-note chord containing D♭-F♯-C-A-E♭-D (an octatonic II subset) precedes a unison F♯ to close the movement.
Example 5.8: I, measures 255-265, showing motive Z taking control of all voices
In the first movement of String Quartet No. 3, Bridge composes a largely standard sonata-arch form. However, it contains some notable idiosyncrasies that have important consequences for the subsequent movements II and III. The slow introduction, providing much of the motivic content, does not lead directly into the P-zone, but rather an up-tempo motive-juggling passage and the introduction of what proves to be the most significant motive of the entire composition, motive X. The typical expressive characteristics of Tr are turned upside down in the exposition, while S largely fulfills our expectation despite melodic parallels to P. Bridge consistently interrupts S-zone material with angular motives X and Z, thereby blurring
formal boundaries. In the development, which is entirely governed by P-zone material until the false recap, Bridge both fragments earlier material and presents it in nearly pristine forms; this starts a process of “eerie overstatement” in which every passage begins to sound like the ghostly apparition of other themes. In the recapitulation, Bridge changes almost nothing besides slight expansion of melodies and the transposition of S up a half step. In the end, motive Z asserts control of the entire ensemble, halting on a six-note subset of OCT II before a definitive ending on F#, one of the “tonal centers” implied by the primary version of Z. It is of note that the movement ends on a unison, and not one of the “stabilizing” Bridge chords mentioned by Huss and Wade. The unison F# ending points to the control the initial presentation of motive Z has on the formal design of the work. Here, the teleological goal generally implied by a sonata-form movement is completely bypassed, and the primary motives and themes are unchanged. As late as measure 255, there is a hint of possible transformation when a transposed, pesante motive Z appears in augmentation in viola and cello. Beginning on F, the motive would outline the tritone between F and B. The expressive rhetoric of the measure, featuring a transformed, grander motive Z with the upper voices first outlining a triad and then an augmented-sixth construction, points toward a kind of transfigured arrival in measure 256. Instead of the lower voices falling by half step to B as we expect, they drop a tritone to F# to return to the original pitch-class presentation of motive Z, which eventually consumes and controls all four voices in the final ten measures after they state untransposed P-zone material. Here is the first major clue that an anti-narrative may be in force: Bridge sets up expectations of transformation in the final moments of the coda, only to deny them drastically and systematically by allowing an unchanging motive to assert control and block any harmonic or thematic development.
The third movement picks up where the first left off, but with a jumbled and confusing formal design thanks to unpredictable recurrences of first and second movement material. To serve as a respite between two exceedingly dense and chromatic movements, Bridge inserts a more tranquil, static second movement. Wade and Huss refer to this as an *intermezzo*, although that moniker is not indicated in the score. The term is fitting nonetheless, as this is a lyrical, simpler movement that serves to connect the outer two. Huss does not have much to say about this movement except that it “occupies a fluid harmonic sound-world, with pedal notes providing points of departure for harmonic exploration while giving the illusion of stability,”  

19 which is indeed the case. The sense of stasis and calm in this movement is a welcome break from the previous cacophony and rhythmic complexity, and we can revel in a sound world largely governed by an ostinato and saturation of minor thirds.

Wade goes into greater detail regarding the second movement, identifying it as a simple ternary form with varied restatements of B and A. In a ternary form, we expect an opening section; a distinct departure from that material, occasionally ushered in or out by transitional material; and a return to opening material, perhaps slightly altered. However, this movement essentially does not allow for such a setup because the material that comprises the A section is segmented into short, distinct snippets that will return at unexpected times. As such, it is difficult as a listener to know when or if a true reprise of the opening section has occurred, because Bridge’s modular approach to the A section material enables the splicing of short segments of earlier material in at will, and in any order. The resulting structure is disorienting and convoluted, even though the sound world and textures exhibit calm serenity, creating a cognitive dissonance between expressive content and structure.

The movement begins with a Bridge chord in measure 1, and measures 1-30 are largely governed by a *pizzicato* ostinato (motive F) shared by cello and viola that sounds remarkably like a ticking clock, in which the viola plays a broken minor sixth and the cello plays a minor third above that (forming an [014] trichord). The first true appearance of this ostinato is on the pitches A-F-G#, and that is how it is most often presented. However, it is transposed at T3 several times. The exploitation of minor thirds is related to the main melodic idea in violin I (motive G), at first outlining a minor third and then a broken diminished triad on E-G-Bb. Violin II adds a counterpoint to the melody on the notes C-B-D (an [013] trichord, motive H), presented as a descending half step followed by an ascending minor third. The combination of these three ideas comprises a sort of “refrain” for the movement, and is presented in Example 5.9.

The opening refrain gives way to a descending figure in the two upper voices featuring half steps and descending tritones in violin I, reminiscent of motive X from movement I, and a pattern of half-step, major third, and whole step in violin II, clearly derived from motive Y in the first movement (measures 11-21). These two melodic figures are repeatedly transposed by minor third as well, and will be referred to as theme J. Another component of the large A section is an oscillating, homophonic idea in all four instruments, recalling the triadic constructions from the slow introduction in the previous movement. That section, from measures 22-25, is theme K. After its appearance, the refrain returns, effectively bringing the opening A section to a close.
Example 5.9: II, measures 1-10, A section refrain showing motives F, G, H

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure Range</th>
<th>Voices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-10</td>
<td>F (vla, cello), G (vln I), H (vln II)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-21</td>
<td>J (vln I, II), F (vla, cel)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-25</td>
<td>K (all voices)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-29 (reprise of 5-9)</td>
<td>F (cel, vla), G (vln I), H (vln II)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Example 5.10: Motivic content of A section

Measures 30-91 do provide a textural contrast to the beginning, but the section grows more formally convoluted as it progresses. The B section is more contrapuntal, and explores tritones, minor thirds, and major thirds at length in all voices (theme L). It leads to an ascent on an OCT I collection, a logical extension of both the prevalent T3-transposed motives from the
preceding section and the concentration of minor thirds beginning in measure 30, and slows in measure 38 with the reappearance of ostinato F. Measures 30-39 reappear truncated in measures 40-46, with the voices swapped. The next part of the B section leads to a dynamic and registral climax (theme M), but the start of the section shares contour and intervallic similarities with Y’ from the first movement. In measure 57, motive X makes a forceful fortissimo return in its original form in the lower voices, causing all the instruments to shudder and recoil on a trill. The appearance of X throws the trajectory of the ternary form off track, and the independent sections will return out of order (Example 5.11).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B section, mm. 30-80</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30-33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34-39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47-59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1 (all voices)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L, truncated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M→climax→motive X!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B and A retrograde, mm. 60-80</th>
<th>B, mm. 81-91</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>60-64</td>
<td>65-72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-72</td>
<td>73-80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-72</td>
<td>81-90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K (all voices)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2 (upper three vcs); F mm. 69-70 (vla cello)</td>
<td>F (vla, cello); G (vln I), H (vln II)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Example 5.11: Chart showing formal idiosyncrasies and thematic content in B section

Measures 81-90 are set apart by the striking reappearance of the opening measures from movement I at pitch in the cello, prompting several recurrences of theme J (a direct derivative of Y from movement I that originally accompanied this tritone exclamation) in unison between violin I and viola (Example 5.12). This is marked meno mosso e tranquillo, with pp and ppp dynamics, along with tremolo ponticello, dolcissimo, and espressivo indications. The effect is a ghostly revisiting of movement I material after the forceful intrusion of motive X from measure 57.
Example 5.12: II, measures 80-90 (above) with Theme J boxed, showing relationship to theme Y (below)
Ostinato F returns in measure 89, and A’ begins in earnest in measure 91 with the refrain from the beginning joined by a new melodic line in the violin that seems familiar due to its reliance on half steps and minor thirds. A chart for the rest of the movement is shown in Example 5.13.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A’, mm. 91-129</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mm. 91-96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F (cello); G (vln II); H (vla); new melody (vln I)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Example 5.13: Form Chart of A’

As Fabian Huss suggests, the second movement of the Quartet immerses us in a sound world. However, I argue that it does not simply give the *illusion* of stasis; it is the *embodiment* of stasis. The off-kilter attempt at a basic second movement ternary form simultaneously and paradoxically confirms and denies our expectations for the form: the A material does come back (confirm), albeit “too many times” (deny through literal overstatement). Similarly, the movement gives us the illusion of movement and progress when there actually is none. It is merely constant recontextualization and reiteration of the same musical information. The movement is 129 measures of minor third, tritone, and half-step saturation as an unrelenting clock ticks away. When the ostinato fades for much of the B material, there are rising lines pushing toward some sort of thematic or harmonic goal only to be thwarted by the return of the ostinato or material from the first movement. The B material itself is somewhat of a phantasmal reappearance of motives from the first movement, reaching an impasse as the head motive from the beginning returns in an uncanny guise. By movement’s end, none of the myriad motives from within or outside of this movement have undergone any transformation, and the unchanging [014] ostinato quietly ends the intermezzo in a temporally suspended, uneasy state.
The respite from the intensity of movement I afforded by the *intermezzo* is immediately negated with the opening of the Quartet’s finale. The third movement picks up precisely where the first left off: motive Z sounds with its original pitch content in the cello, picked up by all the other voices (Example 5.14). The 19-measure introduction is almost entirely saturated with motive Z (even transformed for the first time into its inversion), leading to two stacked sonorities before the first theme emerges. The first, in measure 16, contains the notes C-E♭-A-F♯-D, an octatonic subset. In measure 18, the second chord is slightly altered to E♭-F♯-D-A-F, which is nearly identical to the final chord heard before the unison F♯ in the final moments of the first movement (D♯-F♯-C-A-E♭-D, measures 263-264), and is similarly approached from a unison F♯ in all voices. The effect is that no time has passed and no true development or progress has been achieved since the end of the first movement. The second movement dropped us into a distinct, immersive sound world derived from the first movement’s intervallic content, but this abrupt return to the ending of movement I erases the feeling of that temporary respite from our musical memory.

The relative adherence to sonata form in the first movement, despite some striking idiosyncrasies, gave way to a less-orthodox “ternary form” in the *intermezzo*. The finale is less coherent still, a veritable potpourri of motives and themes from the earlier movements interwoven with some “new themes” that bear striking resemblances to preexisting material. Huss does not affix a formal label to the movement, but addresses some of the thematic recurrences throughout.
Example 5.14: III, measures 1-16, motive Z taking over the texture at the outset
Wade does a comprehensive formal and thematic analysis, in keeping with the scope of his
study, and posits that movement III is “…a modification of the sonata first-movement form—
arch-shaped and with a rondo refrain. It is interesting to note the absence of a traditional
development section.” To affix so many modifiers to a “sonata form finale” seems problematic,
and it seems more appropriate to avoid any formal categorization or over-arching organizational
principle at all with regards to this movement. Bridge has moved from (relative) formal
coherence to a thematic montage of sorts, from a possible narrative conceit to one that avoids the
question, “what has been achieved here?” Indeed, the reappearance of nearly all themes and
motives from the Quartet in their original guises with similar or identical pitch content—and
without significant recontextualization or transformation—makes one question whether the usual
teleological work of large-scale closure of a cyclic sonata has been achieved.

A form chart of the finale is in Example 5.15. After the Z-based introduction, there are a
series of thematic episodes separated by bridging material. The third movement’s theme A is a
relatively new, syncopated melody lasting from measures 20-31, although its ending is not quite
clear. There are through-lines from the first four notes of theme A to Y’, first seen in I/21, and
the descending tritone leap followed by ascending half steps recalls head motive X and even the
tail of the S-theme. These themes are shown in Example 5.16.

The first thematic section presents a small ternary form, with A reappearing before
bridging material of triplets based on theme Y (measures 57-63). The next section (measures 64-
101) explores motive X from the start of the P-zone in movement I, in counterpoint with Y-based
material.

---

20 Wade, “The Four String Quartets,” 400.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Motives/Themes</th>
<th>Expressive Content</th>
<th>Additional Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-19</td>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>Z ascending in all vcs, and in inversion, B.c. punctuation</td>
<td>pp  $\rightarrow$ f, recalls final measures of I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-57</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>&quot;new&quot; theme, related to X (half steps, tritone), Z in inner vcs, 50-51 recall end of S-theme</td>
<td>Risoluto, agitated and persistent</td>
<td>Theme A heard twice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57-101</td>
<td>Transitional</td>
<td>Y-derivative and X variant interact</td>
<td>Dolce  $\rightarrow$ appassionato, poco animato</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102-130</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>&quot;new&quot; theme in vcl, related to S-theme, descent in m. 114 Y-derived, dénouement bridges into next theme.</td>
<td>contrapuntal  $\rightarrow$ unified accompanimental texture, hairpin dynamics</td>
<td>Melody/accompaniment texture, Theme B heard once</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130-180</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>&quot;new&quot; theme emphasizing tritones, minor thirds, half steps (X and Y-derived); syncopated harmonics counterpoint</td>
<td>ppp, dolcissimo, leggiero, eerie, mysterious, ominous</td>
<td>Theme C heard twice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181-250</td>
<td>S-zone reprise</td>
<td>S-zone from I, with syncopated, &quot;jazzy&quot; accompaniment with gradually thickening texture; unification of voices at m. 229-230 (cf: I, 84-85)</td>
<td>p  $\rightarrow$ f, express.  $\rightarrow$ dolce  $\rightarrow$ molto espress.  $\rightarrow$ rinf. appassionato; tempo gradually accelerates from half speed  $\rightarrow$ tempo primo</td>
<td>S-theme heard three times, second appearance at original pitch level, slightly fragmented; third statement matches mvmt. I texture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>251-273</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Z, X, Y return, usher in return of A in vln II and vcl; heard second time in vln I and vcl, Z in vln II, vla.</td>
<td>Energico, risoluto, accented, accelerando</td>
<td>Theme A heard twice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>274-308</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B in vln II, 294-298 features textures reminiscent of S-zone from I, fragmentation leads into C theme</td>
<td>Agitato, f, accented, high register for vla melody, appassionato into dim. Contour rise and fall</td>
<td>Theme B heard once</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>309-330</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Similar to 130-180, truncated</td>
<td>Louder dynamic levels, not nearly as ominous as first presentation</td>
<td>Theme C heard once</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>335-351</td>
<td>Mvmt I intro/Tr reprise</td>
<td>X  $\rightarrow$ Tr (from mvmt I)  $\rightarrow$ X (at pitch from I/1) with accomp. inner vcs (I/5-7)</td>
<td>Slargando, tutta forza (X), appassionato (accomp.); f  $\rightarrow$ p</td>
<td>Expressive character of this reprise much more forceful and intense than intro of mvmt I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>352-403</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Theme A, peppered with Z in second statement, then X and Y in third statement</td>
<td>Begins pp and marcato, quite different from initial presentation; risoluto second statement; risoluto e largamente third statement; gradual dynamic increase from pp  $\rightarrow$ ff</td>
<td>Theme A heard three times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>404-458</td>
<td>4-part Coda (404-411, 412-430, 431-447, 448-458)</td>
<td>I. Y-derived tremolo II. X (frag.) at T3 transposition, Z, leading to recall of end of mvmt I (m. 421), Y descent; X in vcl I (vln I), end of S-theme (vln I) IV. Dénouement, accomp texture from I (5-7), slowed Z loses its C, reduced to E-G-F#</td>
<td>I. f, poco agitato, registral descent II. Animato, Z con fuoco, X molto appass., 426-429 vcl expressivo, con sordino, texture thins III. ppp, trem. pont., a tempo tranquillo, dolce, gradual cresc. IV. mp  $\rightarrow$ p  $\rightarrow$ pp, express., dolcissimo, trem. pont. più tranquillo, perdendosi.</td>
<td>All of coda eschews new themes introduced in mvmt. III, only recalls material from mvmts. I and II.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Example 5.15: mvmt. III, form chart**
The third distinct section (measures 102-123) features a lengthy legato theme (theme B) in the high range of the cello marked *appassionato*, but even this theme, with its focus on half steps and descending thirds, sounds like a conglomeration of intervallic content from motive X and theme Y. The same goes for measures 130-172, the *ppp dolcissimo* section with shimmering harmonics in the viola and a homophonic presentation of yet another theme (theme C). This brings back the expressive and textural characteristics of movement II, along with the theme found in measures 30-33 in violin II.

Following another Z-related bridging material, the S-theme from movement I returns with a jazz-like accompaniment in measure 181. The theme is heard three times, and with each presentation, it begins to sound more and more like its original presentation in the earlier sonata-form movement. The bright, *appassionato* C major harmony returns as a bright, unified front emerging from an asynchronous, highly complex, chromatic disjunction (measure 229), in a highly marked moment. The next eight measures are approximately the midway point of the finale, and features a climax of impressive counterpoint featuring motive X in violin I and viola
over a combined motive Z and theme A in violin II and cello (measures 251-259). This outburst causes almost all the previous material to return in truncated form. The bridging material is largely taken away, and themes A, B, and C are presented in order, leading to a surprising return of Tr from the first movement in measure 335 (it first appeared in measures 52ff. in movement I). The highly unexpected (and sped up) return of Tr brings back another near-verbatim moment from the first movement from measures 339-351: the head motive X presented at pitch with the syncopated chords from measures 5-7 in the accompaniment. This seems like a breaking point of sorts, and we await some sort of transformative action to take place. Perhaps the coda is imminent, perhaps the effort of bringing this material back in its original form will serve as an agent of change for the rest of the movement. In the case of String Quartet No. 3, neither will occur. Theme A returns in measure 352, repeated three times and joined by its frequent companions, motives Z and Y.

Following the extended reprise of A, a melody we have now heard seven times in its entirety, no other material from the finale returns. The final 58 measures are devoted to rehashing motives and even harmonies from the earlier movements. A thorough breakdown of these recurrences is included in Example 5.17.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>mm.</th>
<th>404-411</th>
<th>412-417</th>
<th>418-420</th>
<th>421</th>
<th>422-425</th>
<th>426-429</th>
<th>430-441</th>
<th>442-444</th>
<th>451-458</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vln I</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Z</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vln II</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Z</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viola</td>
<td>X/Z</td>
<td>Z</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cello</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>X/Z</td>
<td>Z</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Z</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Example 5.17: Motivic content of measures 400-458
There are memorable Bridge chords from movement I that recur in a highlighted fashion here. First of mention is the first stacked harmony in movement I, the Bridge chord in measure 15. It appears in measures 400-401 before the Y-based, frightening homophonic tremolo unlike any texture we have previously heard (while still based on motive Y, of course). In measure 421, the *molto appassionato* “scream” from I/258-259 returns in a similarly highlighted way, leading to a unified descent to the start of the slow coda. The coda, beginning in measure 426, opens with the head motive from the very beginning of the work, but transposed. The represented pitches, D-G♯-A-F-B♭-E, were significant in the middle movement as the pitch content comprising motives F, G, and H in measures 1-3/II. The purpose, it seems, is to allow for the return of the descending Y-related line in measures 80-81/II, which appeared in simultaneity with head motive X in its first iteration. This is the first time this motive has been explicitly stated in the finale, and Bridge waits until the closing measures to feature it repeatedly in multiple voices. The ensuing movement I motivic jumble dovetails smoothly into the tail from the S-theme in the violin’s final climax in measure 444.

The dogged motive Z, steadfast and unchanging across the entirety of the composition, at last sheds its rhythmic coil and emerges ominously in measure 453 after an F♯ bass pedal. The F♯ is absent, so we only hear the C-minor triad that comprises three-fourths of the motive. Perhaps this minor triad will close the work? The answer immediately appears to be, no. Viola and violin I play a hairpin C♯ (*tremolo ponticello*), a portentous sign of the imminent ending. The final four measures never revisit the pitch class C, instead focusing on the latter three pitches: E♭-G-F♯ (forming the [014] trichord that was so significant in movement II). Violin II accompanies this broken motive Z and C♯s with an *espressivo* line on E♯-A-C♯, providing something akin to a “dominant” of the closure on F♯. It is of note that violin II plays a descending minor sixth
followed by an ascending major third—a corruption of the “ticking clock” ostinato (ascending minor sixth followed by a minor third) that represented stasis and stagnancy in the intermezzo. The corruption of the contour (descending as opposed to ascending) and the type of third (a game Bridge has played throughout the work), is what allows for the C# to logically appear and boost F# to hierarchical prominence. The final sonority is what Wade identifies as Bridge chord #2, a minor triad joined to its dominant, sharing the common tone between them. In this case, it is an F# minor triad topped with C# major. The composition dies away, denying us the bombastic ending we might have expected given the energetic, intense content of the bulk of the Quartet.

Perhaps the disappearance of the pitch C in motive Z, quelling the opposition of the tritone, provides enough of a transformation or transvaluation for some to declare a goal won. For me, it is not a substantial enough value shift considering the unchanging weight of what came before. This final sonority is not something that was hard-fought—the ending was right before our eyes in the opening measures of the work. In the motive-juggling section of movement I, motive Z makes its first stable appearance in measure 17. Above it are the oscillating pitches of G# and B in violin I, and the syncopated triplet homophony of the inner voices on the pitches A, E#, and C#. The harmony on the downbeat of measure 17 comprises the exact same pitches and voicing as the final sonority in the work, returning in measures 448 and 451. The loss of pitch class C in motive Z is not enough to signal progress or transformation. Rather, Bridge’s String Quartet No. 3 continually hints at progress and transformation but in the course of its wending, thorny, thirty-plus minute duration, all of the motives and themes are deadlocked and unchanging. Nearly all thematic material germinated from the opening nine measures of the Quartet, and was never transformed in any significant, tangible way.
In Lawrence Kramer’s chapter “Narrative Nostalgia,” he refers to the anti-narrative process in Debussy’s *Jeux*, remarking, “As each potential kernel of narrative disappears to be replaced by another in this chain of chains, one hears narrativity continually looming and dissolving away.”\(^{21}\) In Bridge’s String Quartet No. 3, we are constantly baited by the promise of something happening: a standard sonata recapitulation, an unimpeded return to A’ material in a ternary form, a transformative episode for one or even several of the ubiquitous themes that pop in and out of focus seemingly at random. We are consistently denied these processive expectations, and the similar themes become almost maddening as each new, and yet familiar, melody emerges. In the end, Bridge’s attempted adherence to strict formal procedures in the absence of tonality slowly loosened, and we are left with all the characters of a story that was never told.

\*   \*   \*   \*   \*

Epilogue

This project began as an attempt to find a method of analysis malleable enough to apply to various works from a compositionally unpredictable time in musical history. At the turn of the twentieth century, adherence to a tonal system or classical forms was no longer a given, but neither was a turn to free atonality or serialism. When faced with a piece composed during this time, a special challenge is presented to the analyst: which lens(es) can I or should I apply here, and what results might I expect? The path to understanding the music of this time is often as variable as the music itself. As demonstrated in this study, music’s signifying potential remains a

constant no matter the language employed by a composer, and it may be uncovered via myriad narrative strategies. There is no right or wrong way to employ or approach a narrative analysis, and the carefully interpreted music-structural elements should guide the method.

Despite the approximate date of composition and country from which they emerged, the compositions examined in this study could not have been more different. Yes, all four had cyclic elements, but the harmonic and thematic language progressed chronologically from a mostly tonal idiom to one more in keeping with German expressionist ideals. Similarly, the narrative strategies also differed greatly based on the musical-structural elements that seemed to merit closer examination after considering each piece holistically. The beauty of using a narrative approach with works from this time is that the stories I told about this music would likely differ greatly from someone else’s, because music affects and speaks to each of us differently. It is important to clarify that the analyses put forth in the preceding chapters are in no way the right answers, but rather an interpretation that was then supported by empirical evidence in the music.

The analysis of the Vaughan Williams Piano Quintet in C Minor was spurred on by the highly marked INT theme, especially its curious expressive transformation in the third movement. Contextualizing this work in terms of Vaughan Williams’s compositional education and influences, along with his developing interest in analysis of English folk song specifically, led to the establishment of an intertextual relationship with the composers’ own work and another representative of his Brahms-influenced education. The Phantasy Quintet, composed nearly a decade later, establishes a strong conflict of compositional influences right at the start: a purely modal theme gives way to a distinctly German, late-Romantic, chromatic, hexatonic pole. This Wagnerian technique, appearing at the beginning of a work commissioned to revive the tradition of English viol fantasies, immediately presented a pitch-class and harmonic crisis that
plays out over the four-movement work. The perilous road from F major to D major was punctuated with several instances of incremental closural success that reverted to their original presentation, and the parallel with Parsifal’s quest became apparent.

World War I’s devastating impact on European soil and its ripple effect on art, music, and culture could not help but factor into the analysis of a piece written three years after the armistice. The opening machine gun-like gesture and exceedingly stringent, dissonant octatonicism further cemented the Piano Trio’s allusion to the trauma of war, particularly when it is set apart in contrast with modal folk tunes. The appearance of a bugle or machine gun topic ushered in bouts of chromatically tainted nostalgic folk tunes, with only one exception. The centerpiece of the whole work emerged as the only instance of untainted modality, and using Clarke’s expression markings and use of distinct pitch collections as a guide, the analysis focused on the corrupting potential of post-War octatonicism on pre-War idyllic folk songs.

Finally, the dissertation ends with a commentary on traditional narrative trajectories in Frank Bridge’s String Quartet No. 3. The ubiquitous and unchanging motive Z seemed to be established as a potential agent of change; but at the piece’s end, all of the motives and themes from across the work had reappeared in their original forms. This stubborn resistance to transformation, coupled with a gradual loosening of formal procedures that led to an erratic, cacophonous finale, pointed to a seemingly conscious upending of customary storytelling. Borrowing from recent scholarly work on methods of narrative analysis after 1900, and how our narrative labels change to reflect the evolving musical and formal language, the anti-narrative gestures in this work came to the fore.

This dissertation focused on three students of a single composition teacher at the Royal College of Music, beginning with one canonical figure of English twentieth-century composition.
and ending with the mentor of the next. Just as Europe saw great change during the early 1900s, music did as well, especially during the flourishing culture of the English Musical Renaissance. The rich diversity of these compositions necessitates an equally diverse analytical methodology to illuminate the tales they tell.