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ABSTRACT

Anton Webern’s diaries, letters, and personal library catalogs reveal that by 1905 he had become an avid reader of Karl Kraus’s works, especially the popular and controversial journal *Die Fackel*, and that he continued to collect the satirist’s works for over thirty years. Like other Viennese residents, Webern often disagreed with Kraus’s sardonic cultural commentaries, yet he revered the satirist as an eminent Viennese intellectual. In the 1930s Webern’s frequent citations of Kraus during the composer’s *Path to the New Music* lecture series reveal that it was Kraus’s theories on language and ethics that the composer assimilated into his own mature world view.

Webern also admired Kraus’s poetry. In addition to a complete series of compositional materials for “Wiese im Park,” op. 13 no. 1, Webern’s *Nachlaß* also contains manuscripts documenting his attempts to set five other Kraus poems between 1916 and 1924. Although these unpublished Kraus songs were left incomplete, the settings of “Vallorbe,” M. 232, and “Vision des Erblindeten,” M. 236, exist in fairly detailed continuity drafts, and the settings of “In tiefster Schuld,” M. 210, “Flieder,” M. 246, and “Mutig trägst du die Last,” M. 211, exist in multiple, musically distinct sketch fragments.

A detailed archival description of Webern’s Kraus manuscripts highlights some of the multitudinous compositional strategies through which the composer sought to create coherent small- and large-scale formal musical structures within the free atonal idiom. Foremost among these strategies is the use of aggregates to delineate musical subsections, a technique referred to in this study as “aggregate phrasing.” Analysis also reveals that the composer occasionally sought to internally organize these aggregate phrases through complement relations and the manipulation of unordered, fixed-pitch sets, some of which
possess combinatorial properties. Although the octatonic collections play no significant role in most of these sketches, a few contain interesting octatonic sonorities, and one fragmentary setting of “Flieder” definitively demonstrates that the composer worked with octatonic scales in 1920. The study of these manuscripts, both complete and fragmentary, provides insights into the raw musical materials and various compositional strategies explored by Webern during an experimental period of the composer’s development.
CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Karl Kraus (1874-1936), the prominent Viennese author, poet, playwright and irascible social critic, was most distinguished by the popular notoriety of his literary journal Die Fackel, written and published, somewhat irregularly, in Vienna from 1899 until his death in 1936. This little red booklet created a popular sensation from the first day of publication, and through it Kraus continued to delight and infuriate the Viennese public throughout the 922 numbers—some 30,000 pages—that were ultimately issued. The biting satire and self-righteous moralizing that typified the journal’s tone polarized the Viennese public into those who adored and those who hated the satirist, elevating both him and his journal to iconic status within the rather insular world of Vienna. Kraus’s prominence within this milieu is documented by the numerous memoirs of Kraus’s contemporaries that contain descriptions, both positive and negative, of the man, his journal, and his public performances,¹ and all intellectual histories dedicated to this historic context pay respects to Kraus at least in passing.² Likewise, the biographies and


intellectual histories of the Second Viennese School composers also pay tribute to Kraus as an important influence. Arnold Schoenberg, Alban Berg, and Anton Webern are all known to have read Die Fackel faithfully, and Schoenberg and Berg had at least limited personal contact with the journal’s author. The research literature contains a few scholarly investigations into Kraus’s influence on and interaction with Schoenberg and Berg, yet no substantial investigation has been conducted regarding Kraus’s connection to Webern. This research lacuna is particularly significant, since Webern spent a considerable amount of time between 1916 and 1924 occupied with setting Kraus's lyric poetry to music.

Webern’s diaries and correspondence reveal that he had become a regular reader of Die Fackel as early as 1905, and he is known to have collected Kraus’s other published works throughout his life. Interspersed among both effusively positive and acerbically negative assessments of Kraus’s writings, Webern’s correspondence from before World War I also contains passages that elevate Kraus to the status of Mahler, Klimt, Kokoschka, Schoenberg, and other men whom the young composer admired. His letters also indicate that Webern was reading Kraus’s poetry with enthusiasm by at least May 1914, at which time he wrote to Schoenberg and described Kraus’s verse as “herrlichste Dichtung” (most magnificent poetry) and “Kunst” (art). The younger composer did not specify a particular Kraus poem at that time, and he did not do so until the late summer of 1917, when he successfully completed a continuity draft on Kraus’s "Wiese im Park," a poem that he had first tried to set the year before. Letters to Schoenberg and Berg reveal

---


⁴A discussion of Webern’s handwritten catalog of his personal library, which contained many of Kraus’s works, is provided in Chapter 2, pp. 54-58.

that Webern was very pleased with this new work and that he considered it and the other successful song settings from that summer to mark a significant development in his style. After 1914, the beginning of the period that has been dubbed the composer’s “vocal decade,” Webern quickly moved away from the musical aphorism of opp. 9-11 and achieved the new, more expansive and contrapuntal style of the three song collections opp. 12-14. Despite Webern’s achievement, his tendency to compose experimentally and to create and abandon numerous preliminary sketches continued unabated for many years. In a letter to Berg dated 1 July 1917 Webern wrote in relation to his new orchestral songs that "At the beginning I experimented a lot." The multiple preliminary sketches of “Wiese im Park” and numerous other abandoned projects from 1916 and 1917, as well as those from the years to follow, provide ample evidence of this experimentation.

Nearly all of the compositional material documenting Webern’s preoccupation with Kraus’s poetry is now contained in the Paul Sacher Stiftung (PSS) in Basel, Switzerland. Not including the fair copy of the published piano/voice reduction of “Wiese im Park,” Webern’s Kraus settings at the PSS comprise 47 pages of unpublished manuscripts containing settings of six different Kraus poems. During the decade between the beginning of World War I and his adoption of the twelve-tone method in 1924 Webern frequently set the same texts to music again and again. This propensity is particularly evident in his settings of Kraus texts. The composer was occupied with “Wiese im Park” during the years 1916 and 1917, ultimately generating four different versions of this work. After the war years Webern set Kraus’s “Vallorbe,” M. 232 in

---


7The only one of Webern’s Kraus manuscripts that is not at the PSS is the twelve-page printer’s copy of “Wiese im Park,” op. 13 no. 1, which is archived at the Pierpont Morgan Library in New York City.

8Webern further revised the song as late as the end of 1924 and presented the final version of the *Vier Lieder*, op. 13 to Universal Edition in February 1925. The work was
1918, and in 1919 he set Kraus’s lyrical anti-war poem “Vision des Erblindeten,” M. 236, successfully completing a continuity draft of each, although no fair copies were created. These songs remain unpublished and relatively unknown. During 1920 Webern created four fragmentary settings of the Kraus poem “Flieder,” M. 246, and two unfinished settings of his “In tiefster Schuld vor einem Augenpaar” (“Widmung des Wortes”), M. 210. Finally, in 1924 Webern attempted to set Kraus’s “Mutig trägst du die Last” (An eine Heilige”), M. 211, although all three musically diverse attempts were also ultimately unsuccessful. The copious manuscript evidence makes it clear that Webern's sole published Kraus setting, “Wiese im Park,” op. 13 no. 1, does not adequately represent the influence that Kraus's poetry exerted on the composer during the period in question.

**Purpose of the Dissertation**

The purpose of this study is to conduct a critical inquiry into the place of two artists, Karl Kraus and Anton Webern, within their mutual cultural contexts, in order to determine what influence work with Kraus’s poems may have exerted on the composer. The extant correspondence and diaries of Webern have been consulted through both primary and secondary sources in order to understand the relationship, if any, that might have existed between these two men and to understand Webern’s assessment of Kraus’s works and ideas. This study provides a thorough description of all compositional materials related to Webern's musical settings of Kraus's poems. This description serves the dual purposes of promoting further investigation into Webern’s compositional process and development in general, as well as allowing an assessment of Webern’s musical reception of Kraus’s poetry specifically. Since nearly all of Webern’s Kraus songs are fragmentary and remain unpublished, this dissertation is augmented by a great many transcriptions, including edited reconstructions of the continuity drafts of “Vallorbe,” M.

---

finally published in 1926. Along with the full score, the composer's own voice-piano version was issued. Sketches for this arrangement are dated February 1924.

9Webern’s unpublished manuscripts are cataloged using M (Moldenhauer) numbers.
232, and “Vision des Erblindeten,” M. 236. It is not the goal of this study, however, to arrive at definitive readings of these manuscripts—indeed, in many cases it appears that the composer never did so himself. Rather the goals have been to examine the various possibilities that Webern explored for each of these texts, to investigate how these musical conceptions may or may not be related to one another, and to describe the various methods of composition with which Webern experimented during this period. In order to discuss more fully the composer's creative process, the priority of published works cannot be assumed. By avoiding such an assumption, a major criticism of sketch studies, the modernist reification of the work as an abstract and immutable ideal may be avoided, and the craft of composition may be viewed more critically as an ongoing process. The Kraus manuscripts clearly suggest that for Webern composition could be an exploratory and open-ended procedure. Such a view of composition is especially pertinent for this period in Webern's life, when he generated many more unpublished fragments than published works. Only an examination of all the materials can present a complete picture of Webern’s compositional process as an ongoing creative act.

**State of Research**

Karl Kraus’s influence on the composers of the Schoenberg circle is generally accepted as a truism, and every biography of these composers mentions the satirist, often in a rather unspecific manner. As will be detailed below, there have also been brief studies concerning Kraus’s relationship with Schoenberg and Berg, but the work of Susanne Rode-Breymann constitutes the only published research specifically focused on the relationship of Kraus and Webern. In her 1990 article “Gedanken über Kunst: Anton Webern, Karl Kraus, Hildegard Jone” Rode-Breymann investigated the impact of Kraus’s aesthetic principles on Webern and Jone, focusing primarily on Kraus’s concepts of *Ursprung* and the ethical imperative of artistic creation.\(^{10}\) She suggested that, like many other pre-war Kraus enthusiasts, during the 1920s Jone and Webern increasingly

\(^{10}\) *Das Fenster* 24 (1990): 4592-97.
distanced themselves from Kraus’s pessimistic visions of impending apocalypse as they themselves moved toward the more affirmative and Christian-centered ethos of Ludwig von Ficker and others associated with the journal Der Brenner. In "Anton Webern und Karl Kraus: Aspekte einer ungewöhnlichen Kraus-Rezeption" Rode-Breymann investigated Webern's earliest known references to Kraus within the composer’s diaries and extant correspondence, and provided some details regarding the extent of Webern's exposure to and the influence of Kraus's writings. In this article she highlighted the critical distance apparent in Webern's reception of Kraus from some of his earliest references to the satirist's works to his later, generally positive, citations of Kraus’s works in the Path to New Music lectures of the early 1930s. Both of Rode-Breymann’s articles are rich in primary source material and insightful analysis, yet the author was little concerned with Webern's musical response to Kraus's poetry, and neither article is musically oriented. Rode-Breymann was much more thorough in her investigation of Alban Berg's reception of Kraus, and her comprehensive and exhaustively documented book Alban Berg und Karl Kraus provides valuable information and commentary concerning Berg’s reception of Kraus’s works and ideas. Her work is also a valuable source for locating references to Kraus within the Berg/Webern correspondence.

Outside of the work of Rode-Breymann the most insightful discussion of the connection between Webern and Kraus appears in Lauriejean Reinhardt’s 1995 dissertation, “From Poet’s Voice to Composer’s Muse: Text and Music in Webern’s Jone Settings.” Although primarily concerned with a comprehensive investigation of the creative relationship between Webern and Jone, in the last chapter Reinhardt provides an


informative discussion of the dichotomous relationship that developed between Kraus and many of his former enthusiasts during the late 1920s and early 1930s. Reinhardt also argues convincingly that the ethical imperative that intimately links the artistic aesthetic of Webern and Jone was founded on Krausian aesthetic principles regarding the ethical use of language.

Other works that have researched the relationship between Kraus and the composers of the Second Viennese School have been primarily concerned with Kraus’s relationship with Schoenberg. Exploring the interpersonal relationship of the Schoenberg circle with Karl Kraus and others, such as Oskar Kokoschka and Adolf Loos, was a primary purpose behind Joan Allen Smith’s collection of interviews, published in 1986. This series of interviews with several of Schoenberg’s former students and associates reveals that although Kraus and Schoenberg were not intimate, their rather insular worlds intersected through mutual intimate friends, common cultural causes, and personal literary ambitions. These interviews also indicate that Kraus was held in the highest esteem by all members of the Schoenberg circle—particularly the younger men—and that Kraus was for them a model of creative and personal integrity. Ernst Künnek, who, besides Webern, was the only member of the Schoenberg circle to set Kraus’s poems to music, expressed a similar opinion of Kraus’s influence when he wrote, “To us Kraus was the originator of a concrete doctrine of general artistic validity, which was, like no other, designed to illuminate our particular musical path and to give intellectual substance to our production.”

Both Künnek in 1934 and Harry Zohn much more recently have linked

---

14Schoenberg and His Circle: A Viennese Portrait. Many of the men with whom Smith spoke, for example Felix Greissle and Alfred Keller, were students and associates of Schoenberg and Webern during the mid to late 1920s, and therefore their comments do not reflect Schoenberg’s and Webern’s earlier relationship with Kraus.

Schoenberg and Kraus by their essential conservatism, as well as, in Künker’s words, by their “shared position of public solitude.” Alexander Goehr’s articles have also discussed the Krausian foundation of the composer’s aesthetics and have linked Kraus’s views concerning the relationship of ideas and language to Schoenberg’s decades-long and ultimately unfinished project concerning the ideational foundation of music. Goehr’s earlier article “Schoenberg’s Gedanke-Manuscript” is an important source for information concerning Schoenberg’s unpublished Gedanken manuscript and contains numerous direct quotations in German and English translation. Another quite recent source for primary documents concerning the relation of Kraus and Schoenberg is the published exhibition catalog from the Karl Kraus Collection of the Schiller National Museum.

For many years the standard study on Kraus was Leopold Liegler’s Karl Kraus und sein Werk of 1920. Although this work does not present any analysis of Kraus’s works, it is the only book-length study of Kraus before the 1950s and is invaluable as a contemporaneous discussion of Kraus’s historical context. Other valuable contemporaneous accounts include Robert Scheu's Karl Kraus, the special Karl Kraus
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17.“Karl Kraus and Arnold Schoenberg,” Exploring Music, 83.


19.Ulrich Ott and Friedrich Pfäfflin, eds., Karl Kraus: Eine Ausstellung des Deutschen Literaturarchivs im Schiller-Nationalmuseum Marbach, (Marbach am Neckar: Deutsche Schillergesellschaft, 2000), especially 361-71. Several other references to Schoenberg within this catalog are listed in the index.

issues of Ludwig von Ficker’s journal *Der Brenner*, and the articles of Germaine Goblot, Franz Taucher, and Ludwig Hänsel.\(^{21}\) Paul Schick, former curator of the Kraus Archives in Vienna, has published several well-documented articles and a biography, all of which were informed by primary sources.\(^{22}\) Werner Kraft’s *Karl Kraus: Beiträge zum Verständnis seines Werkes* is perhaps the best-known comprehensive source and is particularly noteworthy for the interpretive discussions of Kraus’s poetry, including an analysis of “Wiese im Park” that significantly influenced my own reading of the poem.\(^{23}\) Further interpretive and stylistic analyses of Kraus’s poetry may be found in the dissertation by Elisabeth Kubasta, Caroline Kohn’s *Kraus als Lyriker*, and in the many English-language works of Harry Zohn.\(^{24}\) The English-language works of Wilma Abeles Iggers and Edward Timms also provide comprehensive overviews of Kraus’s context, writings, and ideas, although neither provides a specific discussion of the poetry.\(^{25}\)

Prior to the acquisition of the Moldenhauer Archive’s Webern Collection by the Paul Sacher Stiftung in 1984, there is little evidence in the research literature of scholarly


\(^{23}\) (Salzburg: Otto Müller, 1956).


interest in Webern's middle-period vocal works. Most of the earlier research into Webern's sketch materials had focused on the composer's bound sketchbooks and other sources from the twelve-tone period.\(^{26}\) Some musicological interest in Webern's pre-serial vocal works appeared in the early 1970s in studies such as those by Reinhold Brinkmann, Elmar Budde, and Peter Westergaard.\(^{27}\) These articles were predominantly restricted to works composed prior to World War I and were limited by the unavailability of the loose-leaf sketch materials. More recently the Lieder of Webern's middle period have drawn more interest, yet the works of Hans and Rosaleen Moldenhauer, Shin’ichiro Okabe, Anne Shreffler, Felix Meyer, and the published catalogues of the Paul Sacher Stiftung remain the only sources that contain descriptions of Webern's Kraus sketches.\(^{28}\) Appendix B of the Moldenhauers’ essential Webern biography provides some details regarding the number of measures and pages of the unpublished Kraus sketches identified.
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\(^{28}\)Felix Meyer and Sabine Hänggi-Stampfli, eds., *Anton Webern Musikmanuskripte: Inventare der Paul Sacher Stiftung* 4, 2d ed. (Winterthur: Amadeus, 1994). This catalogue provides only the number of pages for each group of sketches catalogued by title and author of text.
at that time, but, given the monumental nature of the task, Moldenhauer's description of these sources is necessarily cursory. 29  Anne Shreffler's seminal work *Webern and the Lyric Impulse* greatly enhances Moldenhauer's description of these sources, yet she focused primarily on Webern's settings of Georg Trakl's poetry, and it was not her goal to provide detailed descriptions of the Kraus sketches. 30  Shreffler's book is also very useful as a detailed guide to Webern's compositional method during the period in question, and her 1994 article “‘Mein Weg geht jetzt vorüber’: The Vocal Origins of Webern's Twelve-Tone Composition” is an excellent study of Webern's acquisition of twelve-tone technique in the context of his decade-long preoccupation with vocal composition. 31  Felix Meyer's study of an unpublished Webern *Lied* from 1913 also discusses Webern's compositional method, specific details regarding his methods of revision, the condition of the loose-leaf manuscripts, and some of the composer's notational idiosyncrasies. 32  Shin’ichiro Okabe’s study of Webern’s middle-period manuscripts—the most complete version of which is unfortunately available only in Japanese—provides detailed information regarding the paper types and writing implements that the composer used during the period in question and has slightly revised the chronology of these manuscripts. 33  


33 Shin’ichiro Okabe, “Manuscript Studies of Webern’s Vocal Compositions from the Late 1910s and the Early 1920s,” *Polyphone: Biannual Series of Music Criticism* 6
Methodology

The methodological approach of this dissertation is the examination and detailed description of the extant compositional materials containing Webern’s sketches of songs based on Kraus's poems. Nearly all of the manuscript descriptions and analyses in this dissertation have been based on transcriptions made during a visit to the Paul Sacher Stiftung (PSS) in Basel, Switzerland, in August and September of 1997. The only exception is the printer’s copy of “Wiese im Park,” op. 13 no. 1, which is located in the Lehman Collection of the Pierpont Morgan Library in New York. The printer’s copy was studied in the Pierpont Morgan Library in early March 2001, and no transcription was deemed necessary. While studying and transcribing the materials at the PSS very detailed notes were taken regarding writing mediums, multiple layers of revision, indications of erasure, ambiguous notes and accidentals, alternate readings of figures and passages, extra-musical markings, and various other minutiae that were considered potentially useful while interpreting the transcriptions at a later date.

Webern’s diaries and letters held in the PSS were also examined, and some information from these sources has been included in Chapter 2. For the most part, however, no new references to Kraus or his works were discovered in the correspondence within Webern’s Nachlaß. Every reference to Kraus seen by this author at the PSS has been at least paraphrased or alluded to in Moldenhauer’s Chronicle. In those references that Moldenhauer paraphrased or quoted only in part, the original material is reproduced in Chapter 2. For references to Kraus within the various collections of Webern’s manuscripts in Vienna, I have relied on the published correspondence, particularly the thorough and well-documented book and articles of Susanne Rode-Breymann.34


34Alban Berg und Karl Kraus; "Gedanken über Kunst"; "Anton Webern und Karl Kraus."
Overview of Dissertation Organization

The first section of Chapter 2 provides a concise biography of Karl Kraus and a discussion of his major literary works, activities, and personal associations in the cultural milieu of Vienna, placing particular emphasis on his very popular and controversial journal *Die Fackel*. The discussion proceeds from the larger context to the smaller, first addressing Kraus’s eminent status within the Viennese culture at large before ultimately describing the author’s relationship with Schoenberg and his circle. The last three sections of Chapter 2 focus specifically on the relationship between Webern and Kraus, beginning with the composer’s first documented exposure to Kraus’s literature and his opinion of the man and his work between 1905 and 1913, as revealed in the composer’s diaries, extant correspondence, and library catalog. Next, Webern’s reception of Kraus’s poetry between 1914 and 1925 is explored, devoting special attention to Webern’s written responses to this poetry, a description of the poems he chose to set to music, and an examination of those poetic features that might have been attractive to the composer. This section also provides English translations and brief interpretations of each of the six poems and explores common themes and images, such as references to nature, the *Ursprung*, and mother. The final section of Chapter 2 examines Webern’s reception of Kraus during the decade after he stopped setting the satirist’s poetry in 1924, as well as how the composer’s relationship with Hildegard Jone and the *Brenner* circle may have influenced this later reception. Finally, Webern’s references to Kraus in the *Path to the New Music* lectures are examined in order to evaluate how the composer had assimilated Kraus’s ideologies into his own mature aesthetic viewpoint.

Chapter 3 provides a summary of Webern’s compositional process, describing the paper and medium used and the types of manuscripts that comprise this portion of his *Nachlaß*. Many details regarding Webern’s compositional process in the middle period song sketches have already been described by Shreffler in *Lyric Impulse*, therefore the first section of Chapter 3 provides only a brief summary of the most important details relevant to this study. The second section offers some new information regarding various notational idiosyncracies identified in Webern’s Kraus manuscripts, such as the
inconsistent use of rests, accidentals, and, most importantly, the significant role that erasure played in this process. The last section of Chapter 3 presents a table that contains a detailed overview of all of Webern’s Kraus manuscripts.

Chapter 4 provides a description and analysis of each of Webern’s unpublished Kraus settings in chronological order. The first two sections examine the two continuity drafts, “Vallorbe,” M. 232, composed in 1918, and “Vision des Erblindeten,” M. 236, composed the following year. Sections three through five treat the three fragmentary settings of Kraus’s poems. These include “In tiefster Schuld vor einem Augenpaar” ("Widmung des Wortes"), M. 210 (1920), which was set to two musically distinct sketch fragments, “Flieder,“ M. 246 (1920), which exists in four distinct fragments, and “Mutig trägst du die Last” (“An eine Heilige”), M. 211 (1924), which exists as three musically distinct fragments.

Chapter 5 deals exclusively with the compositional history and analysis of Webern’s only published Kraus setting, “Wiese im Park,” op. 13 no. 1. This manuscript series is the only one among Webern’s Kraus manuscripts that represents a complete set of compositional materials, ranging from the two musically unrelated sketch fragments, through the continuity draft, piano/vocal scores, and printer’s copy, to the published setting.

The first half of Chapter 6 summarizes the material of the earlier chapters and addresses the question “Why did Webern set Kraus’s poems to music?” The second half of the chapter provides a discussion of the composer’s compositional development as evidenced through the Kraus manuscripts, focusing primarily on the means through which Webern addressed the problems of creating coherent small- and large-scale formal musical structures within the atonal idiom.

**Overview of Pitch Class Set Analysis and Terminology**

Before a discussion and analysis of these manuscripts can proceed, it is necessary to address matters of method and terminology. Allen Forte’s pitch class set theory provides an extremely useful tool for evaluating and discussing complex pitch class
relationships within the atonal context. The present study draws heavily on Forte’s analytical method and the associated nomenclature, as modeled in his book *The Structure of Atonal Music*,\(^{35}\) although I have adopted slight modifications in an effort to promote readability. Following Forte’s analytical model, the term “pitch class” (abbreviated as “pc” or plural as “pcs”) is used in this study to denote a pitch class that functions globally, regardless of registral placement. As anyone who has studied Webern’s sketches can testify, the concept of octave equivalence—inherent in the use of the term “pitch class”—is not anachronistically applied to this music but rather was very much a working assumption in his compositional method. Forte and others usually follow the term “pitch class” or abbreviation “pc” with a number between 0 and 11, with pc 0 being equivalent to any C, pc 1 being equivalent to any C<, etc. I believe that the use of these numbers often makes the text less reader-friendly, however, so in this study the letter names of the pitch classes are used. Instead of pc 1, for example, in this study that pitch class is referred to as pc C<. Of course, the reductive pitch class set nomenclature is not always appropriate or necessary. The term “pitch” will be maintained to denote a particular pitch within its specific register. When discussing specific pitches the pitch classification system that denotes middle C as c\(^1\) will be used.

The term “interval class,” abbreviated as “ic” and followed by a number between 1 and 6, is used to refer to the shortest possible interval between two pitch classes measured in semitones, and the term “interval” is used to denote the directional or pitch interval between two pitches, using conventional nomenclature. Interval class is calculated from the perspective of octave equivalence, so the largest possible interval class is the tritone or ic 6. To provide another example—one that is particularly pertinent to Webern’s music—the interval between c\(^1\) and b\(^1\) is a major seventh, and the interval between c\(^1\) and d\(^2\) is a minor ninth, but the interval class of both is ic 1.

This study also adopts the indexing system that Forte has developed for identifying collections (sets) of pitch classes with identical interval profiles. These pc set
names are particularly useful when it is the interval content and not the specific order or pitch classes of a given set that is of primary concern. In the following text the names of pc set classes are occasionally followed by a list of the pitch classes in that set, enclosed in parentheses and ordered in normal form. Normal form is the most compact arrangement in ascending order of the pitch classes within a pc set, regardless of the order that these pitch classes may appear in the music. For instance, a melody involving the ordered pitches e<sup>2</sup>-c<sup>2</sup>-c<sup>1</sup>-g<sup>1</sup>-c<sup>1</sup> comprises a 4-18 pc set (pcs C C<sup>1</sup> E G). Such parenthetical collections of pcs are not always provided after a pc set name, but they have been included in some passages to facilitate comparison between different versions of the same pc set.

Pitch class sets are also occasionally described as complementary. For any set, the pitch classes it excludes constitute the complement of the set, so the combination of any two complementary sets will always result in an aggregate; i.e, an aggregate is a collection that includes all twelve pitch classes. Occasionally, again as always to promote clarity, the inherently redundant phrase “complete chromatic aggregate” will be used, but as a general rule, the term aggregate always means the complete chromatic collection.

During the past decade Forte has focused a great deal of analytical attention on the appearance of octatonic pitch configurations in Webern’s pre-twelve tone or so-called “free atonal” music. Although, in my own view, many of Forte’s octatonic analyses of Webern’s works seem overly contrived and dubious, others are quite convincing, and the appearance of numerous octatonic sonorities in these works is undeniable. In order to provide more data for this ongoing discussion, this study often describes interesting octatonic sonorities within the Kraus settings, and a discussion of the degree to which
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such appearances of the octatonic represent the composer’s intention is addressed in the final chapter.

As a matter of convenience and clarity, this study will employ the terminology adopted in Forte’s studies concerning Webern’s use of the octatonic collections. The octatonic scale is a series of eight pitch classes arranged in an ascending pattern of alternating half and whole steps. The highly symmetrical nature of the octatonic pattern results in a scale that has only three pitch-class-distinct forms. Following the precedent established by Pieter van den Toorn, who has written extensively on Stravinsky’s use of the octatonic collection, Forte refers to the three octatonic collections as Collection I (CI), Collection II (CII), and Collection III (CIII). For mnemonic convenience, these collections are named after the pitch class that may be seen as the origin of the octatonic pattern, and the first scalar step up from this origin will be a half step. Therefore, CI begins on C# (pc 1) and continues D E F G A= B= B; CII begins on D (pc 2), and CIII begins on E= (pc 3). The three possible octatonic collections are presented below:

\[
\begin{align*}
CI &= C< D E F G A= B= B \\
CII &= D E= F F< G< A B C \\
CIII &= D< E F< G A B= C C<
\end{align*}
\]

Since the three octatonic collections naturally have the same interval content, any complete octatonic collection comprises a 8-28 pc set, and any octatonic series that is missing only one pitch from the complete collection is a form of the 7-31 pc set. Some of the examples in this study also use Forte’s method of graphically presenting octatonic collections within an analytical music example. Example 1.1 provides both a transcription in reduced score and an octatonic analysis of the first two measures of “Wiese im Park,” op. 13 no. 1. In such examples the following general rule applies: if the stem of a pitch touches a beam, the pitch belongs to the larger musical configuration that is connected by the beam. As Example 1.1 demonstrates, the beams and stems that appear in these graphic analyses are not related to the rhythm of the musical figures but
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Example 1.1: “Wiese im Park, op. 13 no. 1, mm. 1-2

are representative only of the larger octatonic collections to which these pitches belong. In order to reduce the clutter in such music examples, the original rhythms, vocal text, scoring abbreviations, dynamic and articulation markings, rests, and most other “non-pitch” details have been omitted from the analytical examples. These examples are also usually presented along with a transcription of the music, in order to facilitate comparison. The octatonic analysis in the lower three staves of Example 1.1 shows that the opening vocal figure constitutes a 4-18 pc set that is also part of the octatonic
collection 3. The pc set that includes the vocal figure and the top pitches of the two tetrachords in staff 2 comprises a 6-Z13 pc set from the same octatonic collection (CIII), although only the first of the two tetrachords alone is octatonic, and they are thus labeled 4-Z15 CIII and 4-16.

**Editorial Policies in Music Examples of Transcriptions**

As a general rule, any music example in this study that is labeled a diplomatic transcription reproduces the appearance of the original manuscript as closely as possible, maintaining the relative spatial arrangement of the notated elements and including only those accidentals, clefs, rests, dynamics, and instrumental abbreviations that appear in the original manuscript. Exceptions to this procedure occur in those examples labeled as “transcriptions of the final layer,” in which more editorial decisions have been made. Many of these editorial decisions are detailed in the footnotes that accompany the text. Another possible exception is on those occasions when Webern revised or simply clarified a note with letter notation, such as “d,” “cis,” or “ges” (d>, c<, and g=); these are transcribed in music notation with the necessary accidentals, since the accidentals are, of course, implicit in the letter notation. This is a very common occurrence in these manuscripts, so these instances of letter notation will not always be clarified or singled out in the accompanying footnotes, unless they are for some reason dubious or of particular interest.

In order to simplify the accompanying discussion, the music examples in this study also include measure numbers, although Webern never numbered measures in his sketches but only in fair copies. The complete vocal text has also been included in many of the transcriptions, usually underneath the vocal staff, although Webern frequently wrote the text above the vocal staff when sketching. He also neglected to include portions or sometimes a great deal of the text in some manuscripts. In those instances where text has been inserted editorially, brackets will enclose the inserted text.
CHAPTER 2
SOCIAL CONTEXT OF KRAUS AND THE SCHOENBERG CIRCLE

Karl Kraus in the Viennese Milieu

Introduction

Karl Kraus’s prominence among his Viennese compatriots has been the subject of numerous monographs in both English and German. His name appears prominently in many biographies and autobiographies from the period, and all relevant intellectual histories must pay at least passing homage to his influence.¹


There is substantial literature on Kraus in German. Among the most interesting German monographs are Leopold Liegler, *Karl Kraus und sein Werk* (Vienna: R. Lanyi, 1920); Werner Kraft, *Karl Kraus: Beiträge zum Verständnis seines Werkes* and *Das Ja*.
Early Life

Karl Kraus was born in Jiříňín, Bohemia, in 1874, the ninth child and fifth son of Jacob Kraus, a wealthy Jewish paper manufacturer. When young Karl was three years old, Jacob Kraus moved his large family to Vienna. Karl Kraus remained a Viennese resident for the rest of his life. After 1884 Karl attended the Franz-Josephs-Gymnasium, where his schoolmates included the writers Karl Rosner and Hugo Bettauer, comrades with whom he visited Vienna’s theaters and literary coffeehouses. Kraus’s mother, Ernestine Kantor Kraus, died in 1891; he remembered her fondly for the rest of his life, and myriad maternal images honor her in his poetry. According to Karl Rosner, Kraus frequented Vienna’s Burgtheater and suburban theaters, and he was an excellent speaker and mimic.2 Despite his ambition to become an actor, in 1892 Kraus acquiesced to his father’s wishes and entered the University of Vienna to study law. In 1894 he switched to courses in philosophy and German literature, while also continuing to cultivate an interest in drama and performing in several plays. In 1893 he had an unsuccessful debut as an actor in a suburban theater production of Schiller’s play Kabale und Liebe. Preferring to spend his time in the theater and coffeehouses, Kraus attended few lectures at the University, and he would abandon his formal education in 1898 without receiving a

---

degree. Although a passionate interest in theater remained central throughout Kraus’s career, he abandoned his ambition to become an actor and dedicated himself to freelance writing for various publications in Vienna and other cities, an activity in which he already was actively involved.3

Early Works

Between 1892 and 1899 Kraus contributed book reviews, theatrical critiques, and satirical sketches to major Viennese magazines and newspapers, including the Wiener Literatur-Zeitung, Wiener Rundschau, Liebelei, Die Wage, and Neue Freie Presse, as well as periodicals in Leipzig (Die Gesellschaft), Bremen (Neue literarische Blätter), and Berlin (Magazin für Literatur).4 Kraus’s early writings garnered him a degree of success and recognition sufficient to warrant his inclusion in Das geistige Wien (Intellectual Vienna), a lexicon of writers and artists published in 1893, when Kraus was still a teenager.5 Kraus’s first independent publication was Die demolierte Literatur (Demolished Literature),6 published in 1898 as a parody inspired by the destruction of the famous Café Grienstadl, one of the coffeehouses where Kraus had gained first-hand experience of Vienna’s literary cliques. This sharply critical pamphlet was a mocking assault on the mannerisms and literary pretensions of the “Young Vienna” writers, who

3In a late issue of Die Fackel Kraus commented on the ill-fated 1893 theatrical appearance and his decision to leave the theater for journalism. See Die Fackel 912-15 (August 1935): 47.

4The first chapter of Grimstad’s Masks of the Prophet, pp. 3-42, provides an overview of Kraus’s theatrical criticism between 1892 and 1901. All of Kraus’s early (pre-Fackel) publications are reproduced in Frühe Schriften 1892-1900, vols. 1 and 2, ed. Johannes J. Braakenburg (Munich: Kösel, 1979); vol. 3, Commentary (Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, 1985).

5Ludwig Eisenberg, ed., Das geistige Wien (Vienna: C. Daberkow, 1893), 286.

embraced modernism under the leadership of Herman Bahr (1863-1934). Although no names are mentioned in the piece, the thinly-veiled references to “Young Vienna” personalities (including a caricature of Bahr on the pamphlet’s cover)\(^7\) made for Kraus implacable enemies of Bahr, Felix Salten, and other prominent literati.\(^8\) \textit{Die demolierte Literatur} is generally considered to be Kraus’s first important work, and it greatly bolstered his reputation as an independent satirical voice. The next year Moritz Benedikt, the co-owner and editor-in-chief of the \textit{Neue Freie Presse}, offered Kraus a position with that powerful newspaper, possibly in an effort to thwart his plans to form an independent journal, but Kraus refused.

\textit{Die Fackel}

Kraus’s own journal, \textit{Die Fackel}, first appeared 1 April 1899.\(^9\) The enthusiastic


\(^8\)Felix Salten (1869-1945), a highly regarded writer of feuilletons and fictional novels, most famously \textit{Bambi}, was so incensed at his own depiction in Kraus’s satire that he subjected Kraus to a beating.

public reception forced Kraus to send the journal back to the publishers twice in quick succession in order to meet reader demand. Within the first two weeks the first edition of Die Fackel reached an impressive and unanticipated circulation of 30,000 copies. The excitement generated among the Viennese by the inaugural appearance of the little red journal was later captured by Robert Scheu in an essay that he wrote in 1909 to commemorate the journal’s tenth anniversary:

One day, as far as the eye could see, everything was—red. Vienna has not seen such a day since. What murmuring, whispering, spine-tingling! In the streets, on the streetcars, in the City Park, everyone was reading a red magazine. . . . Originally designed to flutter into the provinces in a few hundred copies, the little brochure had to be reprinted within a few days in tens of thousands of copies. And this whole issue, which was so chockfull of wit that, as the Arbeiter-Zeitung put it, one had to read it carefully in order not to miss any of those glittering pearls, had been written by one man.\(^\text{10}\)

After the initial enthusiastic response, the journal’s novelty subsided, polemical divisions alienated many, and by 1906 subscriptions dropped to approximately nine thousand copies.\(^\text{11}\) After 1911 the subscriptions fluctuated between twenty-nine thousand and thirty-eight thousand, and in Kraus’s last years the readership again dwindled to less than ten thousand. Kraus initially intended Die Fackel to appear three times a month, but after 1904 it appeared at irregular intervals, usually four times a year. Due to this irregularity, subscriptions were for a set number of issues, not for a particular span of time. Each

Rezeptionsgeschichte (Munich: Iudicium, 2001).


\(^\text{11}\)Zohn, Karl Kraus, 26.
issue varied in number of pages, the earlier ones being rather small and consisting of 12, 16, or sometimes 32 pages. After 1905 the less frequent issues typically contained several numbers and sometimes ran to more than 300 pages. Starting with no. 263 (1908-09), Die Fackel also appeared in an edition printed and circulated especially in Germany.  

By the time the last issue appeared in February 1936—four months before Kraus’s death—some 37 volumes totaling 922 numbered issues and over 30,000 pages had been published. All but approximately 5,000 of these pages was Kraus’s work alone.

During the first decade of publication Die Fackel was conceived as a forum to which Kraus welcomed comments from readers and submissions from Vienna’s cultural representatives. He used the journal to champion the works of those contemporaries whom he admired, and in some cases he greatly contributed to the fame of writers such as Frank Wedekind, Else Lasker-Schüler, Peter Altenberg, Albert Ehrenstein, and in different fields Wilhelm Liebknecht and Adolf Loos. From its inception, however, Die Fackel was primarily the mouthpiece of Kraus himself; even during the first decade Kraus was solely responsible for two-thirds of the journal, and by December 1911 he stopped accepting submissions and served as the sole author and editor. “I no longer have collaborators,” he wrote. “I used to be envious of them. They repel those readers whom I want to lose myself.”

Other Works

The 37 volumes of Die Fackel constitute the majority of Kraus’s prodigious literary output, and with relatively few exceptions, nearly all of the works that Kraus published outside of Die Fackel were compilations of material that first appeared in the journal. He published seven volumes of prose, arranged according to general themes and published under the following titles: Sittlichkeit und Kriminalität (Morality and...
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12Ibid.

Die chinesische Mauer (The Chinese Wall, 1910), Weltgericht (The Last Judgment, two volumes 1919), Untergang der Welt durch die schwarze Magie (The End of the World through Black Magic, 1922), Literatur und Lüge (Literature and Lies, 1929), and Die Sprache (Language, posthumous, 1936). Poems were a regular feature of Die Fackel, and these were compiled into nine volumes published under the title Worte im Versen (Words in Verse); four volumes were published during the First World War, four in the 1920s, and the last in 1930. The three collections of aphorisms, Sprüche und Widersprüche (Proverbs and Protests, 1910), Pro domo et mundo (For the Home and the World, 1912), Nachts (At Night, 1919), and the Epigramme (Epigrams, 1927), were also drawn from Die Fackel. In addition to his early writings published prior to Die Fackel’s founding, the only published works that did not originally appear in the journal are Kraus’s plays14 (excluding Die letzten Tage der Menschheit, 1922, most of which appeared in Die Fackel during the First World War) and his adaptations of dramatic works by Nestroy, Shakespeare, and Offenbach.

**Polemics**

Kraus’s persona through his writings was that of an uncompromising moralist who doggedly exposed corruption and social injustice within Viennese society wherever he saw it. Independently wealthy and beholden to none,15 Kraus created a journal that delighted and infuriated the Viennese public by leveling acerbic criticism at many individuals, their works, cultural events, the government, and a variety of social institutions, reserving particular contempt for the other Viennese newspapers and journals. Two of his aphorisms clearly illustrate his attitude toward the press: “Journalism only apparently serves the day. In reality it destroys the intellectual

14*Traumstück (Dream Play, 1923); Wolkenkuckucksheim (Cloud Cuckoo Home, 1923); Traumtheater (Dream Theater, 1924); Die Unüberwindlichen (The Unconquerable Ones, 1927).*

15Early issues of Die Fackel contained a few commercial advertisements; after 1913 Kraus refused all advertisements. See Zohn, *Karl Kraus*, 28.
receptivity of posterity,” and “Newspapers have approximately the same relationship to life as tarot readers do to metaphysics.”

Harold Segel summed up Kraus’s contempt for the Viennese press in the following manner:

Kraus believed he had ample reason for running herd on newspapers and newspaper writers. The hypocrisy and venality of the press, which was controlled at the time by a handful of print barons, mirrored the rot that lay beneath the surface of Habsburg society in its twilight years. Worse yet, it was, Kraus believed, the newspapers themselves with their own low moral standards that bore considerable responsibility for shaping, indeed manipulating public opinion, often in self-serving ways. To Kraus, this was nowhere more obvious than in the chauvinism and war hysteria whipped up by the big Vienna papers both before and during the First World War.

In Kraus’s view the leading Vienna papers not only contributed to the corruption of societal morals, but they also were responsible for the equally heinous sin of lowering German literary standards. Kraus expended what many undoubtedly considered to be an inordinate measure of energy and Die Fackel’s space subjecting other publications to the most rigorous and public proofreading, redressing grammatical errors and heaping ridicule on the clichés and stylistic sloppiness that were common fare. As in all matters, Kraus here considered his position of stylistic and grammatical correctness to embody the inexorable standard, and he persecuted offenders of correct grammar with the same vehemence with which he indicted all purveyors of societal corruption and injustice.

One of Kraus’s most effective devices for satirizing Vienna’s newspapers was the use of Glossen (Glosses), quotations and pictures from the daily press that were reproduced in Die Fackel. The Glossen were either juxtaposed against one another, accompanied by Kraus’s commentary, or simply left to stand alone in self-indictment. Kraus appreciated the irony of using his enemies’ own words to illuminate the essentially pernicious character of their discourse. The Glossen first appeared in 1908 as answers to

---


17Segel, Vienna Coffeehouse Wits, 58.
fictitious readers’ letters, but by 1911 the appropriation of scurrilous material from the daily press became one of the journal’s regular features.

A recurring theme in Kraus’s attacks on the press was his contempt for the feuilleton, a genre popularized in the nineteenth century and prominent in the European press. His abhorrence of this genre led him not only to criticize the form itself and to heap scorn on its leading practitioners, but also to publish the pamphlet Heine und die Folgen (Heine and the Consequences, 1910), in which he blamed Heine for introducing the feuilleton to Germany from its native France. Kraus faulted Heine for debasing the German language through his encouragement of journalism. This sentiment is the essence of one of Kraus’s most famous aphorisms: “Heinrich Heine so loosened the corset of the German language that today every little salesperson can fondle her breasts.”  

With the exception of very few, such as Edward Hanslick and Peter Altenberg, Kraus despised and attacked all writers of feuilletons with equal fervor. For Kraus the writing of feuilletons was a sin comparable to that of owning a newspaper.

There were few newspaper owners, editors, or journalists who were not castigated by Kraus on various occasions, but Kraus’s relentless campaign against the Hungarian print baron Imre Békessy was particularly bitter. Békessy, who was rumored to have fled Hungary to avoid prosecution after the war, appeared in Vienna in the early 1920s and founded Die Stunde and three other newspapers. A war profiteer, extortionist, and owner of newspapers known for their superficiality and sensationalism, Békessy became for Kraus a composite symbol for all that was wicked and corrupt. In addition to the series of denunciations that appeared in Die Fackel under the title Békessiade, Kraus called for Békessy’s expulsion before crowds of one thousand people in his lectures in the spring and summer of 1925. His written campaign used the slogan “Hinaus aus Wien mit dem Schuft” (“Let’s get the crook out of Vienna!”), and he referred to Békessy almost

18Karl Kraus, from Pro domo et mundo, reproduced in Beim Wort genommen, 241. “Heinrich Heine hat der deutschen Sprache so sehr Mieder gelockert, daß heute alle Kommis an ihren Brüsten fingern können.”

When law enforcement and political officials refused to bring formal indictments against Békessy, Kraus’s dogged personal efforts resulted in the Hungarian’s leaving Vienna. Kraus also fearlessly waged a related campaign against Johannes Schober, the Vienna Chief of Police (and later Chancellor of Austria), whom he accused of being in collusion with Békessy. Kraus’s *Die Unüberwindlichen*, published in 1929, was a thinly disguised dramatization of Kraus’s campaign against post-war corruption, as it was embodied in Békessy, Schober, and the financier and banker Camillo Castiglioni.

Kraus’s vendetta against the proprietor of the *Neue Freie Presse*, Moritz Benedikt, was somewhat less vigorous, if even more long-standing. Kraus’s contempt for Moritz and his enterprise reached its peak before and during the First World War, when the pacifist Kraus denigrated the newspaper’s militarism and chauvinism. Other high-profile polemics were waged against the Zionist leaders Theodor Herzl and Max Nordau, the “Young Vienna” feuilletonists Herman Bahr and Felix Salten, the German exclusively as “der Schuft.”

---

20 Ibid., 111.

21 Kraus summarized the Békessy affair in *Die Stunde des gerichts* (*The Hour of Judgement*) in *Die Fackel*, 730-31 (early July 1926).

22 Grimstad, *Masks of the Prophet*, 211.

publicist Maximilian Harden, the German critic Alfred Kerr, the author Franz Werfel, and many others.

Lectures and Theater der Dichtung

Beginning in 1910 and continuing until the final months of his life Kraus gave a series of public presentations that he initially referred to simply as “Vorlesung Karl Kraus” (“Karl Kraus Lecture”) but after 1925 came to call “Theater der Dichtung” (“Theater of Poetry”). In these one-man shows Kraus presented readings of his works from all genres, usually items that were scheduled to appear in future issues of Die Fackel, although he also re-read essays, poems, and aphorisms that had appeared in previous issues and published collections. Kraus also presented works by numerous other writers, and many of his “Theater der Dichtung” consisted mostly if not entirely of works by Gerhart Hauptmann, Berthold Brecht, Peter Altenberg, Frank Wedekind, Johann Wolfgang von Goethe, Detlev von Liliencron, and August Strindberg, among others. In addition to the readings of his own and others’ prose and poetry, the “Theater der Dichtung” increasingly featured Kraus performing the plays of Nestroy and Shakespeare, as well as Offenbach operettas, in adaptions created by himself or others. Kraus performed every role in the dramatic works and sang all parts in the operettas to the accompaniment of a pianist. Zohn wrote the following concerning Kraus’s musicality:

Karl Kraus could not read music and had a flexible voice that was more suited to Sprechgesang than to singing. Yet his was, by all accounts, a kind of by-the-seat-of-his-pants musicality that made him a quick study, even though he refused to take voice lessons, and allowed him to memorize, with just a few run-throughs, all the songs from the fourteen Offenbach operettas that he presented in 123 of his 700 public recitals in programmatic opposition to the Viennese operetta of his time . . . .

24 Zohn, Karl Kraus and the Critics, 33. Two of Kraus’s piano accompanists, Franz Mittler and Georg Knepler, have written of their experience. See Franz Mittler, “It Wasn’t Easy, but It Was Nice,” in Diana Mittler-Battipaglia, Franz Mittler, 171-73; this essay originally appeared in German as “Es war nicht leicht, aber schön,” Forum 3/30 (June 1956). See also Knepler, Karl Kraus liest Offenbach: Errinnerungen, Kommentare, Dokumentation (Vienna: Löcker, 1984).
In the “Vorlesung,” and especially in the “Theater der Dichtung,” Kraus had returned to the stage that he had largely abandoned in the 1890s. Apparently, he was a formidable orator. Many accounts by his contemporaries extolled the linguistic and dramatic prowess with which he kept his audiences spell-bound. Kraus’s performances were held frequently, before paying crowds that filled Vienna’s largest venues. His first public reading, in January 1910, was given in Berlin, where Kraus would eventually perform more than 100 times. His lecture tours also took him to Prague, Munich, Paris, and many other German, Austrian, Swiss, Czech, and Italian cities. The proceeds from these readings were given to various charitable institutions, a fact that Kraus frequently recounted in *Die Fackel* in painstaking detail. By the time of his death of heart failure 12 June 1936 Kraus had given some 700 lectures and readings, the last on 2 April, just a little over two months before his death.

Within the primary sphere of this influence, his life-long residence of Vienna, Kraus’s scathing but satirically masterful attacks on that city’s institutions, artistic life, and major personalities polarized the Viennese public into those who admired his intransigent insistence on the highest moral standards in all aspects of Austrian cultural life and those who saw him only as a destroyer. Between these extreme views there lived a man of incisive intellect and fervent idealism, who saw himself as a defender of a moral order that was doomed to destruction in the light of modernism in all its forms. That Kraus reveled in this status is beyond doubt, as is obvious in the following aphorism, in which he disparagingly summarized/defamed his own contribution:

> Let my style capture all the sounds of my times. This should make it an annoyance to my contemporaries. But later generations should hold it to their ears like a seashell in which there is the music of an ocean of mud.


26*Pro domo et mundo*, reproduced in *Beim Wort Genommen*, 209. “Alle Geräusche der
Kraus and the Second Viennese School Composers

The persona conveyed in Kraus’s writings is that of a reclusive, even misanthropic bachelor sequestered in his study both day and night, vehemently composing diatribes against the decadence and injustice of Viennese social and political life. This rather one-dimensional view of Kraus originates in the sardonic and vitriolic wit of his satire and, although based in truth, contradicts much that is known about the author’s private life.  Although Kraus never married, he enjoyed the company of woman—for instance, his well-documented infatuation with the actress Annie Kalmar, who was the inspiration for numerous poems and the play *Traumstück* (*Dream Play*, 1922), and he had at least one great, long-standing love interest, the Baroness Sidonie Nádherný von Borutin. Although Kraus’s polemics earned him many enemies among the Viennese intelligentsia, he was not generally antisocial and had a small following of loyal, even worshipful, admirers. Chief among his closest friends were the bohemian author and poet Peter Altenberg and the well-known architect Adolf Loos, both of whom were also intimate associates of Schoenberg, Berg, and Webern.

Zeitlichkeit seien in meinem Stil gefangen. Das mache ihn den Zeitgenossen zum Verdruss. Aber Spätere mögen ihn wie eine Muschel ans Ohr halten, in der ein Ozean von Schlamm musiziert.”

27 For a discussion of the dichotomy posed by Kraus’s satiric persona as opposed to his private life, see Timms, *Apocalyptic Satirist*, 169-75.

28 Annie Kalmar was the stage name of Anna Elisabeth Kaldwasser. The correspondence between Kraus and Kalmar has recently been published as *Wie Genies sterben*’: *Karl Kraus und Annie Kalmar, Briefe und Dokumente 1899-1999*, ed. Friedrich Pfäfflin and Eva Dambacher (Göttingen: Wallstein, 2001). For the best discussions of Kraus’s relationship with her, see Kraft, *Karl Kraus*, 315-26 and Timms, *Apocalyptic Satirist*, 72-75.

29 Kraus met Sidonie Nádherný in 1913 and, aside from brief periods of estrangement, was intimately involved with her until his death. Many of Kraus’s letters to her have been published as *Briefe an Sidonie Nádherný von Borutin: 1913-1936*, ed. Heinrich Fischer and Michael Lazarus (Munich: Kösel, 1974). See also Kraft, *Karl Kraus*, 337-58, among others.
Kraus was clearly an enigmatic and intimidating figure in Vienna, a prominent man of letters who was temperamentally unsuited to literary circles, cliques, or salons. Anecdotal references among his contemporaries describe Kraus as a solitary figure of irascible temperament, who preferred the exclusive company of his most intimate comrades. Oskar Kokoschka, who contributed to *Die Fackel* and associated closely with both Kraus and Schoenberg prior to World War II, described the satirist in the following manner:

Karl Kraus was a frightening figure in Vienna. No one would have dared to talk to him. . . . They were frightened by his edition the *Fackel*. . . . He was a cruel man, so he was frightening for the Viennese. . . . He was absolutely intolerant with everybody, and he gave permission to see him in the café at a certain time in the evening when he ate his dinner. He ate a sausage, a very sharp sausage. . . . And then there were three or four men—always Adolf Loos and always Altenberg. . . .

Alban Berg, in a letter to his wife dated 1 July 1908, also described Kraus as a lone figure among the coffeehouse cliques:

But then the strumming began on the café terrace, and I had to run away. They all marched on, the Altenberg group, the Klimt group, and the solitary Karl Kraus—we two lonely ones were kindred spirits. In the evening I met Smaragda at Altenberg’s table in the Löwenbrau beer-cellar, then she went home with Ida, while I met Karl Kraus—Dr. Fritz Wittels was also there, all very nice. At 3 a.m. we all went home.

Although, as already mentioned, Kraus’s first highly-regarded work, *Die demolierte Literature*, attacked the literary cliques of Vienna’s coffeehouses and permanently alienated him from the “Young Vienna” modernist authors, Kraus was himself a regular fixture in these stylish cafés. Harold Segel, whose book *The Vienna Coffeehouse Wits*,

---


31 Joan Allen Smith, *Schoenberg and His Circle*, 33.

1890-1938 provides an interesting and succinct discussion of the Viennese literary coffeehouse culture, described Kraus’s place there:

Like any real Viennese he [Kraus] spent a fair amount of time in the coffeehouses and indeed held court at his own table. The atmosphere of the coffeehouse literary milieu as a whole undeniably found reflection in his own writing. Even if this may seem out of character, Kraus had a real sense of the theatrical and was fond of performing. In this, he was also a product of his environment.33

Schoenberg and Kraus were interlinked through the network of friends and associates that the two shared, such as Oskar Kokoschka, Adolf Loos, and the poet Else Lasker-Schüler. Most important among these was Loos, whom both Schoenberg and Kraus counted among their most intimate friends. Kraus published Loos’s articles in Die Fackel and supported the architect’s career by securing him lucrative commissions.34 The satirist was influenced by Loos’s architectural aesthetic, which favored practical necessity over ornamental ostentation in the design of functional objects and buildings, and he incorporated Loos’s ideas in his own assault on journalism, particularly the feuilleton. In May 1909 Kraus wrote, “The debasement of practical life by ornament, demonstrated by Adolf Loos, finds its counterpart in the permeation of journalism by elements of higher culture, which has led to a catastrophic confusion. Phraseology is the ornament of the mind.”35 A widely-quoted aphorism from December 1913 also highlights Kraus’s identification with Loos’s ideals:

Adolf Loos and I, he literally, I in the sphere of language, have done nothing more than show that there is a difference between an urn and a chamber pot, and that it


is only by maintaining this difference that there is any room for culture.\(^{36}\)

Loos also saw his aesthetic to be akin to that of the Schoenberg circle, and he was a partisan supporter of their music. A more gregarious person than Kraus in general, Loos associated much more widely and was more interested and active in Viennese musical life. He attended performances of the music of the Schoenberg circle on a regular basis. He was an active participant in the concert series presented by the Akademischer Verband für Literatur und Musik (Academic Association for Literature and Music) and later the Verein für musikalische Privataufführungen (Society for Private Musical Performances), and he stood his ground beside the Schoenberg circle in the various concert scandals in Vienna (particularly 1913) and Salzburg (1922).\(^{37}\) As a lifelong friend of Kraus and an intimate associate of the Schoenberg circle, Loos served as an important link between the rather insular worlds of Kraus and Schoenberg. The depth of their mutual attachment to Loos can be heard in a letter that Webern wrote to Josef Polnauer after Loos’s death in August 1933:

Adolf Loos died yesterday evening, Wednesday the 24th. . . . The burial is tomorrow, Friday the 26th around 6 o’clock in the evening in Kalksburg. . . . In accord with the wishes of Kraus only the most intimate [companions] should be notified of the time and place of the funeral.\(^{38}\)


\(^{37}\)See Moldenhauer, Chronicle, 349.


See also Moldenhauer, Chronicle, 399. Webern wrote to Hildegard Jone and her husband Josef Humpliks on 26 August 1933 regarding this funeral; see Anton Webern Letters to Hildegard Jone and Josef Humplik, ed. Josef Polnauer, trans. Cornelius Cardew (Bryn Mawr, PA: Theodore Presser, 1967), 21; originally in German as Anton Webern Briefe an Hildegard Jone und Josef Humplik, ed. Josef Polnauer (Vienna: Universal Edition, 1959). The funeral oration delivered by Kraus was printed in a very
Although the relationship between Kraus and the Schoenberg circle may have been formal and distant, clearly Kraus, Schoenberg, Berg, and Webern were all among the “Intimsten” centered around Adolf Loos.

**Kraus and Schoenberg**

Arnold Schoenberg was the first of the Second Viennese School composers to meet Kraus, and he shared the closest personal and professional relationship with the author. The extant correspondence and the memoirs of their compatriots indicate that the relationship between Kraus and Schoenberg was one of mutual respect, warmth, and influence, but that it was also somewhat distant and ambivalent. Primary sources also suggest that they were most closely associated between 1905 and 1918; after World War I there are no extant letters between the two and very few accounts of personal meetings. Schoenberg first met Kraus in Vienna’s Café Griensteidl in 1895 through his future brother-in-law, the composer Alexander Zemlinsky. It is not clear how often such meetings may have occurred between the two men; only two post-Griensteidl meetings have been documented, but the extant correspondence suggests that there may have been...
more. For instance, in March 1910, on the occasion of declining to publish some of Schoenberg’s aphorisms, Kraus returned the composer’s contribution with the following note:

I also thank you very much for your literary contribution. Unfortunately, although it interested me very much, I cannot include it in Die Fackel. Aphorisms should not in fact be a heading in Die Fackel, but only a necessity of life for me. I hope to discuss this with you soon verbally—perhaps in the Café Imperial one afternoon. \(^42\)

Another mention of a desired coffeehouse meeting appears in a letter from the middle of World War I. After requesting a second ticket for an upcoming performance of Kraus’s “Theater of Dichtung,” Schoenberg’s letter of 14 November 1916 speaks of a deep spiritual crisis:

I hope I will soon find an opportunity of meeting you in the coffeehouse. I am thirsting . . . for a conversation with you. In the period of unbearable depressions, since the beginning of the war, your word[s] have often been a consolation to me. \(^43\)

Even though Kraus’s outspoken pacifism estranged him from the nationalism of Schoenberg and his followers in the war’s early years, Schoenberg continued to hold Kraus in high esteem, was an avid reader of his work, and sought intimate conversation.

Although Schoenberg was not among those who consistently attended Kraus’s lectures and performances, he did so on occasion, and he, like Berg and Webern, was a


\(^{43}\)Stuckenschmidt, Arnold Schoenberg, 244; German version, 223. “Hoffentlich finde ich bald Gelegenheit, Sie im Kaffeehaus zu treffen. Ich durste . . . nach einer Aussprache mit Ihnen. In der Zeit unerträglicher Depressionen, seit Kriegsbeginn, war mir Ihr Wort oft ein Trost.”
dedicated reader of *Die Fackel*. \(^{44}\) Schoenberg admired Kraus’s writing style, and he frequently cited Kraus as his model for German prose. \(^{45}\) Schoenberg also submitted his own works for inclusion in *Die Fackel*, and although the editor sometimes refused these submissions, as mentioned above, both the composer’s writings and music appeared in its pages on occasion. Following an uproar at a concert of Schoenberg’s music on 21 December 1908 the composer wrote a response to the acerbic criticisms that had appeared in the Viennese press and sent it to Kraus for publication in *Die Fackel*. \(^{46}\) Kraus refused the submission, explaining his decision in an accompanying letter dated 21 January 1909:

I have no close connection to your art, but for the sake of the faith that you have professed in it, I would like to dissuade you from such brawls with critics. If I wanted to introduce observations of Vienna musical life into *Die Fackel*, I would use them only in a form which avoided the appearance of an internal polemic against a particular reporter. . . . If you want to state in so many words the fact that a fifty-sixth-rate critic had disrupted your concert and what happened further, then *Die Fackel* is open to you. . . . I would not recommend naming the full name of the culprit. One could write a book about a nonentity, but to address oneself directly to such a nonentity, no matter how briefly, dignifies him with greatness. \(^{47}\)

---

\(^{44}\) According to Stuckenschmidt, *Arnold Schoenberg*, p. 183, Schoenberg eventually accumulated Kraus’s complete works within his library.


\(^{46}\) Schoenberg’s response to the critics has been translated by Leo Black as “A Legal Question” in *Style and Idea*, 185-89. According to Willi Reich, Schoenberg expanded his ideas on music criticism into a longer essay that appeared in October 1909 under the title “Über Musikkritik” in the Viennese musical periodical *Der Merker*. See Reich, *Schoenberg: A Critical Biography*, trans. Leo Black (New York: Praeger, 1971), 38; originally in German as *Arnold Schoenberg, oder der konservative Revolutionär* (Vienna: Verlag Fritz Molden, 1968), 59.

Apparently, Schoenberg was able to rewrite the article in a style and tone that Kraus found more appropriate, because the mid-February issue of Die Fackel does contain the composer’s open letter to the critic Ludwig Harpath regarding the latter’s critique of his Second String Quartet.\textsuperscript{48}

After declining to publish some aphorisms that Schoenberg submitted in March 1910, Kraus did reproduce one of Schoenberg’s songs in the journal, “Sprich nicht immer von dem Laub,” the fourteenth song from the composer’s opus 15, \textit{Das Buch der hängenden Gärten} (\textit{The Book of the Hanging Gardens}), settings of fifteen poems by Stefan George.\textsuperscript{49} Schoenberg had sent Kraus a presentation copy, and in late March 1910 Kraus devoted a page of \textit{Die Fackel} to a facsimile of that very brief song. The piece was the last submission from the composer to be included in \textit{Die Fackel}. The song stands without commentary, an emblem of the professional respect and tacit support that existed between Kraus and Schoenberg.

Although there is no record of Kraus’s having attended performances of Schoenberg’s music, he obviously sensed in the composer a kindred spirit, and he lent the composer both tangible and intangible support. In September 1911 Kraus was among 48 signatories of a printed pamphlet that was circulated by Berg in order to raise money to assist Schoenberg.\textsuperscript{50} According to Moldenhauer, this funding petition was not yet completed before Schoenberg decided to abandon Vienna and relocate to Berlin. Shortly after his move to Berlin in December of that same year Schoenberg suggested to

\begin{itemize}
\item Die Fackel 272-73 (15 February 1909): 34-35.
\item Die Fackel 300 (March 1910): 9.
\item Moldenhauer, \textit{Chronicle}, 147.
\end{itemize}
Universal Edition that they send a complimentary copy of his new book *Harmonielehre* (*Harmony Instruction*, 1911) to Karl Kraus, among others.\(^{51}\) The uncharacteristically humble dedication that Schoenberg wrote in the front cover of Kraus’s copy speaks clearly of Kraus’s influence on the composer: “I have perhaps learned more from you than one should if one wants to remain independent.” Schoenberg later recalled this dedication in a brief article he contributed to a special “Karl Kraus” edition of Ludwig von Ficker’s journal *Der Brenner*.\(^{52}\) In addition to Schoenberg, the thirty contributors to the *Rundfrage über Kraus (Survey on Kraus)*\(^{53}\) included renowned authors, academicians, and artists, such as Else Lasker-Schüler, Richard Dehmel, Frank Wedekind, Thomas Mann, Adolf Loos, Georg Trakl, Peter Altenberg, Hermann Broch, Franz Werfel, Oskar Kokoschka, and Stefan Zweig. This collection of accolades was conceived in 1913 to defend Kraus against a journalistic attack,\(^{54}\) but more importantly it was meant to resound against the conspiracy of silence to which Kraus was subjected by most of the Viennese press. This publication was certainly of interest to all members of the Schoenberg circle, and Webern reported to Schoenberg on 30 October that he had read Schoenberg’s essay during the previous summer.\(^{55}\)

Kraus’s favorite whipping-boy, the Viennese press, provided him and the

\(^{51}\)Stuckenschmidt, *Arnold Schoenberg*, 151. According to Stuckenschmidt, others to receive first copies were Wassily Kandinsky, Carl Einstein (an art historian of the *Blaue Reiter* circle), Alma Mahler, Justine Rosé (Alma Mahler’s sister), Carl Möller, and Alexander Zemlinsky, “also to art magazines, but as few as possible to musical critics.”


\(^{53}\)The Brenner Verlag in Innsbruck republished these laudatory essays for Kraus in 1917 under this title.

\(^{54}\)Zohn, *Karl Kraus and the Critics*, 27.

Schoenberg circle a common enemy. Comparable to the concert scandal of December 1908, the end of March 1913 witnessed another and probably more famous uproar at an Akademischer Verband concert in Vienna’s Musikvereinsaal on 31 March 1913.\textsuperscript{56} The tumult in the audience, which so interrupted the performance that it was discontinued, spilled over into several articles in the city’s newspapers in the following days. These articles, appearing in Die Zeit, the Neue Freie Presse, and other major Viennese newspapers, were, at best, unsympathetic to the composers and concert promoters involved and, at worst, viciously fractious. In a series of letters to Schoenberg between 2 and 7 April, Berg aired his outrage over “the various distortions in the papers”\textsuperscript{57} and his resolve to compel Die Zeit to print retractions. There is even a discussion of a possible libel suit, but Berg ultimately received little satisfaction for his efforts. A letter to Schoenberg from 7 April expressed Berg’s frustration:

But as I see the present situation (no retraction appeared today either!), it’s all the same who sends in the correction, whether Webern or I or the publisher: it won’t be printed! The papers know that no one will sue anyway, or they’re willing to take that chance! And yet this would be an opportunity for once to break the incredible power, the inviolate position of the press!

A pity that Kraus wasn’t in Vienna, he would certainly have written about it, one could have given him this article in particular (and others as well) through Loos. Now it’s already a bit late, has gone up in smoke, and maybe he won’t hear of it.\textsuperscript{58}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{56}The concert program consisted of the following: the premiere of Webern’s Six Pieces for Orchestra, op. 6; Zemlinsky’s Maeterlink Songs, nos. 1, 2, 3 and 5; Schoenberg’s Chamber Symphony, op. 9; the premiere of Berg’s Five Orchestral Songs on Picture-Postcard Texts by Peter Altenberg, nos. 2 and 3; and Mahler’s Kindertotenlieder. The tumult in the audience began early in the performance during Webern’s op. 6, but the concert continued with difficulty through Berg’s orchestral songs. Mahler’s songs were not performed. See Stuckenschmidt, Arnold Schoenberg, 184-87.
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{57}Letter from Berg to Schoenberg, 2 April 1913. Quoted by Juliane Brand in The Berg-Schoenberg Correspondence: Selected Letters, ed. Christopher Hailey and Donald Harris (New York: W. W. Norton, 1987), 166.
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{58}Berg-Schoenberg Correspondence, 171. The article to which Berg referred appeared in the 2 April Die Zeit, in which it was hinted that Schoenberg had performed works by Webern and Berg to repay them for financial support in the past.
\end{flushright}
Karl Kraus had not been in Vienna for the concert or its immediate aftermath, because he was in Munich giving a lecture on 29 March in honor of the 150th anniversary of Jean Paul’s birth. He did comment on the scandal at the Akademischer Verband concert, however, in the next issue of *Die Fackel* (nos. 374-75), appearing 8 May 1913. In the article Kraus states that the crux of the controversy had nothing to do with response to new music, but how and when to express a negative response. Kraus also castigated the Viennese press for exacerbating the affair in its typically salacious fashion.\(^59\)

The same issue of *Die Fackel* that included Kraus’s commentary on the concert scandal also contained the program of the 16 April Kraus lecture that was held in the small hall of the Musikverein. Berg attended this lecture, writing to Schoenberg about it both before and after the event.\(^60\) Webern, who had traveled to a spa in Portorose immediately after the disastrous concert, did not attend the lecture. He was curious about the event, however, and he wrote to Berg on 16 April to ask, “How was the Kraus lecture (on 16 April 1913)? Was Altenberg there?”\(^61\) Although Berg’s letters of early April entreated Webern to join him in demanding corrections and retractions from the newspapers, Webern did not take any such action. In fact, his letter of 7 April encouraged Berg not to dwell on the affair any longer. Webern wrote that he felt “almost redeemed from all these nauseating matters.”\(^62\) He maintained that the whole affair was not really a battle about art at all and that the perpetrators of the scandal were unworthy of their attention and anxiety: “To the newspaper the cause itself does not matter, they simply want to enthral the public with obscenity, and the greater the obscenity, the more

---

\(^59\) *Die Fackel*: 24-25.

\(^60\) Brand et al., eds., *Berg-Schoenberg Correspondence*, 173-74.

\(^61\) Quoted by Rode, “Anton Webern und Karl Kraus,” 315. Kraus’s 16 April lecture included readings of sketches from Peter Altenberg’s new book, *Semmering 1912*. “Wie war die Kraus-Vorlesung (am 16.4.1913)? War Altenberg dabei?”

\(^62\) Moldenhauer, *Chronicle*, 173; *Chronik*, 156. “. . . fast erlöst von den ekligen Dingen.”
satisfying it is for them. Our works and ourselves are completely unimportant.” In this same letter Webern also expressed his pleasure at an earlier issue of Die Fackel, forwarded to him in Portorose by Königer.

After 1918 there are very few primary sources that link Schoenberg and Kraus. Perhaps the demands of their professional successes, their differing spheres of influence, and their incompatible working methods (many anecdotal references assert that Kraus slept during the day and worked at night) made interaction increasingly difficult. The only documented post-World War I meeting between them occurred on 20 October 1920 and is noted in Webern’s Diary 6. In this brief entry Webern wrote that he accompanied Schoenberg to Baden for a visit to Adolf Loos, who was very sick, and that they then spent a quarter of an hour at Kraus’s apartment. Although Schoenberg and Kraus were involved more personally prior to 1918 than after, there is no evidence of a hostile break—a circumstance that certainly happened between these two acrimonious personalities and others of their acquaintances—and Schoenberg continued to esteem Kraus until the end of his life. The following handwritten note from Schoenberg’s Nachlaß expresses the composer’s reverence:

I have always admired and respected Karl Kraus. I was never hindered in my estimation [of him], neither by his faults that were constantly obvious to me, his mistakes, his injustice, his misjudgments in comparing the valuable with triviality, nor through the occasional epigram clearly aimed at me. . . . Our personal relationship later became very warm: I believe, I am one of the few who enjoyed

---

63Ibid., “Der Zeitung ist doch der Anlaß wurst, sie will einfach das Publikum ergötzen durch die Schweinerei; und je größer die Schweinerei, desto befriedigender ist sie. Unsere Werke und Personen sind ihr ganz nebensächlich.”

64Quoted by Rode, “Anton Webern und Karl Kraus,” 315-316. “Königer bat ich, mir rasch die “Fackel” zu schicken, bis jetzt habe ich sie noch nicht. Ich freue mich sehr auf das Heft.” Paul Königer was a composition student of Berg and later the husband of Wilhelmina Webern’s older sister, Maria. At the time of this letter the most recent issues of Die Fackel were 370-71 (March 1913) and 372-73 (1 April 1913).

his complete respect as a character. 66

The following dedication that Schoenberg wrote for his work Style and Idea, and which is now preserved in the Schiller National Museum, is similarly reverential:

To my deceased friends, my relatives in spirit, my Anton von Webern / Alban Berg / Heinrich Jalowetz / Alexander von Zemlinsky / Franz Schreker / Adolf Loos / Karl Kraus / all those people with whom I could talk in a similar way to how I talk in some parts of this book.

They belong to those people, with whom you did not need to discuss the principals of music, of art, of artistic and bourgeoise morality. There was a tacit but clear mutual agreement in all those things. Except for the fact that every one of us was constantly striving to deepen these principles and formulate them more strictly and to refine them to the utmost degree. 67

**Webern’s Reception of Die Fackel, 1905-1913**

Webern’s earliest exposure to Kraus and his written work was most likely through the publication and popular notoriety of Die Fackel, first published in 1899. Since the


Sie gehören zu jenen, mit denen man die Prinzipien der Musik, der Kunst, der Künstlerischen und bürgerlichen Moral nicht zu erörtern brauchte. Es bestand ein stilles und klares gegenseitiges Einverständniss in all diesen Dingen. Außer daß jeder von uns ständig daran arbeitete, jene Prinzipien zu vertiefen und strenger zu fassen und sie bis ins letzte zu verfeinern.”
journal was widely distributed in several cities throughout Austria, Webern may have been familiar with Kraus’s work even before he and his family moved to Vienna in the fall of 1902. The immediate and enduring popularity of Die Fackel in the city of its origin, as well as the strong public reaction that it often provoked, assures that Webern would have been exposed to Kraus’s writings during his university years. After Webern commenced his studies with Schoenberg in the autumn of 1904, the elder composer undoubtedly influenced Webern’s reception of Kraus, and after this time we find the first direct evidence that Webern had become a regular reader of Die Fackel.

Webern’s earliest written references to Die Fackel refer not to Kraus specifically but to the writings of other authors who were published in the literary journal. An entry in Webern's “Reisetagebuch” (Diary 3, pp. 20-21) from the summer of 1905 suggests that the young composer's reception of Frank Wedekind's plays, specifically Hidalla, had been influenced by Kraus’s journal. Webern attended the performance of Hidalla at the Munich Schauspielhaus and wrote a diatribe concerning the moral questions posed by the drama.68 The resulting lengthy diary entry paraphrases the words of both Wedekind and Kraus as they appear in Die Fackel 182, dated 9 June 1905. The first 14 pages of this issue of Die Fackel reproduce an introductory lecture originally presented by Kraus at a 24 May Viennese performance of Wedekind’s Die Büchse der Pandora. This essay contains a quotation concerning Hidalla which Webern paraphrased in the following diary entry:

Three greatest barbarisms in our culture are:
a) the old virgin
b) the high regard for virginity before marriage
c) the scorned and harassed prostitute

Regarding a) there Frank Wedekind is completely correct; what could be uglier than an old virgin, for the singular reason that she is unnatural in the highest degree?]

Concerning b), likewise, he speaks the purest truth. It is the highest arrogance and insolence that a man require a woman to retain her virginity up to the marriage ceremony. For what reason should the woman be refused that of which a man

68 Moldenhauer, Chronicle, 80.
makes such frequent use?

Concerning point c) Frank Wedekind has the following view of sexuality; each man has an absolute claim to the favor of each woman, and conversely the woman who gives [such favor] to everyone who wants it, the prostitute, is the ideal of woman, and he now regards it as barbarism to despise the prostitute and to chase [her] into misery.69

The idea of these “three barbarisms” obviously originated in Wedekind’s own words as they appeared in Kraus’s published lecture:

On these superstitions are founded the three barbaric forms of life of which I spoke: the prostitute who is ostracized from the human community like a wild animal; cheated old maidens who are condemned to being physical and spiritual cripples throughout their entire lovelives; and those who preserve the virginity of young women for the purpose of securing a favorable marriage.70

---

69 PSS film 111.1-0203; also quoted by Susanne Rode, "Anton Webern und Karl Kraus," 313.

Die größten Barbarismen unserer Kultur sind:

a) Die alte Jungfrau
b) die große Wertschätzung der Jungfräulichkeit vor der Ehe
c) die verachtet und gehetzte Dirne.

Zu a) Da hat Frank Wedekind vollkommen recht; was kann es häßlicheres geben als eine alte Jungfrau, einzig aus dem Grunde, weil sie in höchstem Grade unnatürlich ist.

Was b) anlangt, spricht er ebenso die lauterste Wahrheit. Es ist die höchste Anmaßung und Frechheit des Mannes, vom Weibe zu verlangen, daß sie ihre Jungfräulichkeit bis zur Eheschließung mit ihm bewahre. Aus welchem Grunde sollte dem Weibe verwehrt sein, von dem der Mann einen so ausgiebigen Gebrauch macht?

Betreffs Punkt c) Frank Wedekind hat folgende Auffassung vom Geschlechtsleben; jeder Mann hat ein unbedingtes Anrecht auf die Gunstbezeugung jedes Weibes und umgekehrt das Weib, das sich jedem hingibt, der es will, das ist die Dirne, das Ideal des Weibes, und er hält es nun für Barbarei diese Dirne zu verachten und ins Elend zu hetzen.

70 Frank Wedekind, quoted by Kraus in Die Fackel 182 (9 June 1905): 13-14; also quoted by Rode, "Anton Webern und Karl Kraus," 313. Rode mistakenly cites the Die Fackel issue as both 182 and 183 at different points in her article. “Auf diesem Aberglauben aber beruhen die drei barbarischen Lebensformen, von denen ich sprach:
Kraus had arranged a private performance of Wedekind's scandalous play *Die Büchse der Pandora* for invited guests at Vienna’s Trianon-Theater. Alban Berg and his brother Hermann attended this performance. Schoenberg received an invitation to the occasion, which he returned to Kraus with the following letter on 15 May:

"Honored Kraus, unfortunately I must decline to attend the performance of *Die Büchse der Pandora*, because on Thursday evening I have to attend to some very pressing matters. I am returning the invitation to you with many and heartfelt thanks. A pity: it is bad luck. I was looking forward to it."

Webern’s earliest reception of August Strindberg also must be viewed in the light of Kraus’s advocacy of the author’s views and his early works. The views expressed by Wedekind and paraphrased by Webern in his diary entry resonate sympathetically with views that Kraus himself repeatedly espoused, most notably in the essay "Sittlichkeit und Kriminalität" appearing in *Die Fackel* 115 (September 1902): 1-24. This essay heralded the beginning of a sustained attack by Kraus on the legal enforcement of arbitrary moralistic attitudes. It is not known whether or not Webern read this essay at its first appearance, but this essay was republished in 1908 along with several other works in a collection entitled *Sittlichkeit und Kriminalität*. This collection is listed in the personal library catalog that Webern began compiling in 1914, as will be discussed below.

71 *Die Fackel* 182 also contains a letter from Wedekind to Kraus, thanking the latter for his promotion of the play. The playbill of this performance is reproduced on page 15 of the journal. The play’s program indicates that Wedekind played the role of Jack the Ripper and Kraus that of Prince Kungo Poti. The original cast list is reproduced in Timms, *Apocalyptic Satirist*, 76; see also Hans Weigel, *Karl Kraus oder die Macht der Ohnmacht* (Vienna: Fritz Molden, 1968), 75.

72 This may have been Berg’s first, though indirect, contact with Kraus. The young composer made copious notes regarding Kraus’s introductory lecture. One can well imagine that Berg’s reaction to the play and to Kraus’s lecture influenced Webern’s reception. See Mosco Carner, *Alban Berg*, 36.

of Kraus’s journal. Kraus first began publishing Strindberg’s works in Die Fackel in November 1907, but it was not until July 1908 that Webern wrote in a letter to Ernst Diez that he had discovered a “wonderful poet” of “marvelous intelligence.” Webern had spent the summer of 1908 absorbed in Strindberg’s The Red Room, Zones of the Spirit, and The Black Flags, and he continued to read Ghost Sonata and A Dream Play during the summer of 1909. Both Schoenberg and Berg are known to have been very interested in Strindberg’s publications during this period, as well, and he remained an important author for these composers for many years. Webern’s interest in Strindberg may not have been directly related to the author’s appearance in Die Fackel, but several references to Strindberg also make direct reference to the journal:

Have you already read the Strindberg things in the latest Fackel? It seems to me that he has never spoken more wonderfully. I have also read the Ghost Sonata. Indeed, I do not know if there is anything so outrageous. I have read it twice already. It leaves me speechless.

Several months later Webern wrote to Schoenberg concerning another Strindberg essay, “Eingebildete Kranke” (“Hypochondriac”), which appeared in Die Fackel no. 300, dated at the end of March 1910. In this letter we also find Webern’s first written recognition


75Moldenhauer, Chronicle, 109.


77Die Fackel 300 is the issue that contains the facsimile of Schoenberg’s op. 15 no. 14, “Sprich nicht immer.”
of Kraus’s own writings.

I am hugely pleased concerning Die Fackel. Above all I find the Krausian stuff wonderful. Is it not so? Strindberg’s essay is incredible. 78

Between 1910 and 1914 references to Kraus and Die Fackel become much more frequent in Webern’s extant correspondence. Unfortunately, however, the typically reticent Webern rarely elaborates on his personal reaction to a particular essay, aphorism, or poem. References to Die Fackel in Webern’s correspondence are most often mere mentions of the journal, brief comments on the recent appearance of a new issue or complaints about the difficulty of finding a copy. An example of such a letter is the one sent to Schoenberg during Webern’s stay at Preglhof in the summer of 1910. Lamenting his inability to participate actively in the cultural life of Vienna, Webern also complained of the difficulty in finding recent issues of Die Fackel:

Has a new (Fackel) appeared since May 31st? Could you send the issue to me along with the music? I am so outside of the world here; nowhere can I get Die Fackel. Please forgive me for asking you for such a thing. 79

Clearly, by this point Webern had become a regular reader of Die Fackel, and he felt that reading it would make him feel more “inside the world” of his beloved Vienna. Given the journal’s myopic concentration on Viennese cultural life, Webern probably appreciated the journal as a convenient, if idiosyncratic, compendium of life and events within the capital city. Die Fackel often contained excerpts from other Viennese newspapers—the Glossen that were a regular feature of the journal—as well as announcements of selected cultural events and, of course, Kraus’s critiques of anything


that drew his attention. Most importantly, Webern’s letter of 6 June 1910 illustrates that
*Die Fackel* served as a valued source of common reading material for Webern and his
associates.

In the correspondence from later that same summer Webern’s growing esteem for
Kraus himself becomes more obvious. On 23 June 1910 Webern, inspired by Otto
Weininger's book *Über die letzen Dinge*, wrote in a letter to Schoenberg:

Tell me, can one at all describe thinking and feeling as something entirely
different? I cannot imagine a sublime intellect without the ardor of emotion. This
is certainly the case with Weininger; and with Strindberg, Plato, Kant, Kraus? It
simply flows directly out of these human beings. . . . I am presently thinking of
the following men: you, Kokoschka, Mahler, Kraus, and Weininger.  

In this letter Webern included Kraus in the esteemed circle of the Viennese cultural elite
to which Webern himself aspired to belong. The inclusion of Kraus among his artistic,
musical and literary idols is a significant indication of the importance that Webern had
come to place on Kraus's position in Viennese culture. Webern considered the
intellectual climate of Vienna to be uniquely fertile, and his extant correspondence after
1910 provides examples of Webern’s awakening to the profundity of Kraus’s
contribution. Webern’s letter to Berg of 14 December 1911 again recognizes Kraus
within the dynamic milieu:

Wouldn’t it be great, if everyone who today is notable were together in one city in
lively interaction. Schoenberg, Klimt, Altenberg, Loos, Kraus, us, Kokoschka,
and many others.

---

80Quoted in Moldenhauer, *Chronicle*, 113; *Chronik*, 100. “Sagen Sie, kann man
überhaupt Denken und Fühlen als etwas gänzlich verschiedenes bezeichnen? Ich kann
mir keinen großartigen Intellekt ohne die Glut der Empfindung vorstellen. Bei Weininger
ist doch das gewiß so; und bei Strindberg, Plato, Kant, Kraus? Das kommt halt aus dem
Menschen heraus, unmittelbar. . . . Ich denke jetzt immer an folgende Männer: Sie,
Kokoschka, Mahler, Kraus, Weininger.”

81Quoted by Rode, *Alban Berg und Karl Kraus*, 392. “Es wäre so schön, wenn alle
Leute, die heute was sind, in einer Stadt beisammen wären, im regsten Verkehr.
Schönberg, Klimt, Altenberg, Loos, Kraus, wir, Kokoschka und viele andere.”

This quotation is in reaction to a gloss entitled “Kempinski” that appeared in *Die
Although Webern apparently had arrived at a largely positive assessment of Kraus by 1910, he did not agree unconditionally with the satirist, and, unlike Berg, Webern was selective in his praise of Kraus’s commentaries. Berg, who was a faithful Kraus devotee, must have listened to many harsh opinions from Webern against Kraus; in a letter to his wife from July 1909 Berg briefly mentions in passing Webern’s criticism of Kraus. As was characteristic of Webern, his reaction to Kraus’s works was effusive, ranging between unbridled enthusiasm and vehement opposition. Regarding Kraus, the composer’s written comments from the pre-war period were most expressive and specific when he found an essay offensive. Few of Kraus’s writings raised Webern’s ire more than the satirist’s caustic criticism of Viennese cultural life, especially in a series of articles and aphorisms from 1911 and early 1912 that disparaged Vienna in comparison to the city of Berlin (another city in which Kraus’s journal was popularly published).

Webern’s letters reveal that he considered such attacks to be personal affronts to Schoenberg and other men whom he admired:

You, Mahler, Kraus, Kokoschka, Altenberg, then surely also Klimt, where else is there anything like that? Loos, Roller, Zemlinsky. One only has to hear what is going on at the Berlin Opera. Is it really so important that one can finish dinner in a restaurant in Berlin about ten minutes earlier than in Vienna? Sure, it is good. But how can one so blindly overlook the other magnificent achievements? I do not understand Kraus on this point.

Webern was also displeased over a collection of quotations and descriptions (Glossen) that Kraus published in Die Fackel 334-35 (and on many occasions read aloud)

---

82 Alban Berg: Letters to His Wife, 72; Briefe an seine Frau, 88. “I am not even angry when Kraus abuses Strauss, when Webern criticizes Kraus, when Oppenheimer despises Böcklin and praises Puccini . . . .”

under the title “Wien.”  These quotations illustrated the collisions between the Viennese public and several eminent historical figures, such as Ludwig von Beethoven, Ferdinand Raimund, Robert Schumann, Anselm Feuerbach, and Richard Wagner. Webern responded to this article by writing to Berg and quoting the opinion of Schoenberg:

“They must not deliver it to its enemies.”

Subsequent reactions to Kraus’s criticisms of Viennese culture became even more vociferous:

Uncultured; uncouth. Filth, nothing but filth. This song of praise for Berlin! Outrageous! If Kraus really knew about this filthy city? Wretched! Wretched!

This Kraus! Professional satirist! He wants to be a satyr at all costs! Highest ideals! With hooves and horns! That’s what a satyr looks like, no? Satyr instead of a human being. Heathen instead of Christian! I have had enough of this man. A joker! Journalist!

It is interesting to note that Webern’s final insult in this letter was to call Kraus a “journalist,” a curse that he probably came to know through Kraus’s own criticisms. Webern’s reaction to Kraus’s opinions was typical of many Die Fackel readers of his under the title “Wien.” These quotations illustrated the collisions between the Viennese public and several eminent historical figures, such as Ludwig von Beethoven, Ferdinand Raimund, Robert Schumann, Anselm Feuerbach, and Richard Wagner. Webern responded to this article by writing to Berg and quoting the opinion of Schoenberg:

“They must not deliver it to its enemies.”

Subsequent reactions to Kraus’s criticisms of Viennese culture became even more vociferous:

Uncultured; uncouth. Filth, nothing but filth. This song of praise for Berlin! Outrageous! If Kraus really knew about this filthy city? Wretched! Wretched!

This Kraus! Professional satirist! He wants to be a satyr at all costs! Highest ideals! With hooves and horns! That’s what a satyr looks like, no? Satyr instead of a human being. Heathen instead of Christian! I have had enough of this man. A joker! Journalist!

It is interesting to note that Webern’s final insult in this letter was to call Kraus a “journalist,” a curse that he probably came to know through Kraus’s own criticisms. Webern’s reaction to Kraus’s opinions was typical of many Die Fackel readers of his

84 Die Fackel 334-35 (31 October 1911): 48-60.


time—angry rejection coupled with unflagging interest. Webern was frequently at odds with Kraus as a cultural critic, and the composer had little appreciation of Kraus’s sardonic satire, but he continued to read Kraus’s journal and to collect his published works throughout his life.

At the end of 1913, a year that had seen Kraus and the Schoenberg circle in close association on several occasions, Webern presented Berg with one of Kraus’s books as a Christmas present. The book, Pro domo et mundo, which was also in Webern’s library, was sent to Berg with the following letter:

This time for Christmas Pro domo et mundo. You were no Latinist; that means “for house and world.” That must be an old adage. I do not know what Kraus means by it. But for me it means this: the small within the large . . . ; or nothing is small. Everything is important, testimony of the unapproachable. Your will be done, not mine.

Well into the next year Webern’s literary interests continued to center around the works of Karl Kraus, as well as Strindberg, Hans Bethge, and the plays of Wedekind. During an Easter vacation with his father, which included trips to Klagenfurt, Pregelhof, and a short prospecting tour in the mountains, Webern wrote to Berg that he would travel to Vienna and attend a Kraus lecture. This announcement of Webern’s intention to attend a Kraus lecture is the only such comment to be found in his correspondence. The lecture was held on 22 April 1914, and the program of the lecture is reproduced on page 17 of Die Fackel 399. Webern was deeply impressed by Kraus’s presentation, and in a

---


89Moldenhauer, Chronicle, 186-187.


91Die Fackel 399 (18 May 1914): 17. The announcement of the most recent lecture lists the following items in the program: “Momентаufnahmen / Die Inhaltsangabe des
letter to Schoenberg on the day after the lecture Webern provided a rare insight into his affinity with the author.

And if it is ever the case that I too am fatherless, then looking back is beautiful. But that is no looking back, it is a look into the timeless, thence also ahead toward the “origin.” (That is such a wonderful thought by Kraus. He speaks so often of the origin.)

Webern’s Library Catalog

The importance of Kraus’s publications to both Schoenberg and Webern is evidenced by the personal library catalogs that the composers began in the years 1913 and 1914 and updated for many years to follow. Schoenberg began his library catalog in January 1913. Among the authors listed in Schoenberg’s collection, the twelve books by Kraus are surpassed in number only by the 28 volumes by Strindberg. Richard Dehmel, Stefan George, and Immanuel Kant are also represented in Schoenberg’s library by more than ten books each. Webern’s handwritten catalog, which the composer began at the end of June 1914, reveals that Webern was an avid reader of Kraus’s works at this time and that he continued to read and collect Kraus’s works throughout his life.


93 Stuckenschmidt, Arnold Schoenberg, 183.

94 The notebook pages appear on the PSS microfilm entitled “Korrespondenz, Texte, Dokumente,” beginning on microfilm page 111.1-0488 (second filming, 1995). Webern titled and signed the book on the front cover: “Bücher und Noten, A v. Webern.” Webern used several writing media in the catalog, and not all of the handwriting is legible on the microfilm copies, such as the light red ink that appears in some of the Kraus entries. This
Webern first started his library catalog that summer as his family packed their belongings and prepared to move from Vienna to Stettin, where he had accepted a post as second conductor in the theater. According to Moldenhauer, Webern continued to add entries to this catalog through 1929. The 129-page library catalog, now preserved in the PSS, contains an alphabetical list of authors and composers, along with the books and scores by each that Webern possessed in his library. Under the letter K several Kraus entries appear as follows:

**Karl Kraus**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pro domo et mundo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sprüche und Widersprüche</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heine u. die Folgen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XV. Jahrg. der “Fackel” vollständig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVI. &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVII. &quot; fehlt 405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVIII, XIX “Die letzten Tage der Menschheit”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volkle u. Epilog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literatur (1921)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traumstück (1923)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Träumtheater (1924)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sittlichkeit u. Kriminalität (gehört Paul)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Epigramme[”]; Literatur u. Lüge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Wolkenkuckucksheim”; “Timon u. Athen”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first three book entries (Pro domo et mundo, Sprüche und Widersprüche and Heine und die Folgen) and that for volume XV of Die Fackel (1913) are all written in the same

small, attractive, bluish-green notebook is quite fragile.


96A few of the entries are not listed alphabetically by author but alphabetically by title; for instance, the *Chinesische Flöte* appears under “C”.

97This word is not clear in the manuscript, but “gehört” (belongs to) makes sense. The Paul referred to here may be Webern’s intimate friend Paul Königer.

98PSS microfilm 111.1-0510 (2nd printing, 1995). Webern wrote “fehlt” [missing] by Die Fackel issue number 405 beside the “XVII. Jahrg”; however, according to the cover of issue 405, it appeared “Ende Februar 1915, XVI Jahr.”
black ink and handwriting, so it appears that Webern owned three Kraus books and one complete year of *Die Fackel* issues at the time that he started the catalog. This deduction is supported by another list of books and music that appears on the third page of Webern’s Diary No. 4. This page is entitled “Bücher u. Noten aus Stettin” and contains a list of those books and scores that Webern brought from Stettin.99 Yet another list, titled “Zu Mutter,” was also compiled, and it may reasonably be presumed that these are items Webern intended to leave at the family residence at Pregelhof.100 Again the entries in both lists are alphabetized by author or composer. Each entry is in three columns, one that provides the number of books, one that provides the author’s or composer’s name, and a third that occasionally provides a general comment. Among the entries appears the following:

3 Kraus alles

Apparently, Webern took all of his Kraus materials (the three books mentioned previously) along with him to Stettin (or at least that was his intention when he made this list).

Although the largest portion of Webern’s personal library was lost or destroyed after the fall of Vienna at the end of World War II, the remnants of that library reveal that his interest in Kraus’s publications continued to the end of his life. The written report of Dr. Werner Riemerschmid, who was the first to inspect and salvage Webern’s possessions at the family home in Vienna, provided this general description of the remnants of Webern’s library:

I went into the yard and found there some enormous coal sacks, stuffed full with uniform pieces, shoulder flaps [epaulettes], with soiled things (like egg shells, old wash rags and such), crumpled paper, letters, torn issues of the periodical *Die Fackel* and piano reductions.101

---

99 Diary 4 begins on PSS microfilm page 111.1-0212 (2nd filming, 1995).

100 Both Rode and Moldenhauer have interpreted the two lists in this manner.

Later on this same page of the report, in addition to a general description of the deplorable condition of the house and the difficulty Riemerschmid faced in salvaging the material, Riemerschmid lists the following items:

- about one thousand (if not more) letters from Anton von Webern to his wife
- many letters from Alban Berg to Anton von Webern
- one sketchbook of Anton von Webern (now in the possession of U.E., Vienna)
- quite a few piano reductions and small scores (printed)
- some letters from Arnold Schoenberg in America to Anton von Webern
- some twenty volumes of the journal *Die Fackel*. ¹⁰²

*Die Fackel* ceased publication in 1936, the year of Kraus’s death. Apparently, Webern had kept numerous issues of *Die Fackel* for the intervening years, and it is likely that his collection had contained more issues than Riemerschmid found strewn about the premises. Those *Die Fackel* issues that were found have not been preserved.

---

**Webern’s Reception of Kraus’s Poetry, 1914-1924**

The published correspondence between Schoenberg and his two primary students contains many references to Kraus’s aphorisms, essays, glosses, and other pieces from *Die Fackel*, yet Webern’s correspondence contains no mention of Kraus’s poetry until 1914. Kraus first began publishing his own poetry in *Die Fackel* in 1911, ¹⁰³ but the earliest

---

¹⁰² An die tausend (oder noch mehr) Briefe von Anton von Webern an seine Gattin; viele Briefe von Alban Berg an Anton von Webern; ein Skizzenheft von Anton von Webern (nun im Besitz der U.E. Wien); etliche Klavierauszüge und kleine Partiturheften (gedruckte); einige Briefe von Arnold Schoenberg aus Amerika an Anton von Webern; etwa zwanzig Hefte der Zeitschrift ‘Die Fackel.’”

¹⁰³ Harry Zohn wrote that “Kraus began to write poetry comparatively late in life; his first poems appeared in *Die Fackel* in 1912 and 1913” (see Karl Kraus, 65), but Kraus’s
evidence of Webern's interest in this poetry is found in a letter to Schoenberg dated 26 May 1914:

To write to Karl Kraus would be to me an absolute necessity. I am just so self-conscious around him. Perhaps my enthusiasm would only annoy him. Kraus in particular becomes ever more to me lately. I feel that everything [he does] is the most magnificent poetry, art.  

While no specific poem is mentioned in this letter, we can be confident that Webern was reacting to poetry that he had encountered in a recent issue of Die Fackel, for the first of the nine volumes of Worte im Versen did not appear until 1916.

The first Kraus poem specified in Webern's extant correspondence is "Wiese im Park." The earliest compositional sketches on this poem are dated 1916, but the earliest references to the poem in Webern's correspondence are found slightly later, in letters to Schoenberg and Berg from the summer of 1917:

I am now deep into work again. I believe it is going successfully. And I hope it will continue. I have written two orchestral songs. One on the poem "Wiese im Park" by Karl Kraus, one on a poem by Trakl. Gradually, I am gaining clarity again. I thank your “Pierrot” for that.

“Widmung des Werkes”—one of the poems set by Webern)—appeared in Die Fackel 317-18 from February 1911. This minor error has been perpetuated in a few subsequent publications. This same poem was published in the first volume of Worte in Versen under the title “Widmung des Wortes,” but Webern’s fragmentary settings of this poem are cited in this study and in much of the Webern literature by the poem’s first line, “In tiefster Schuld vor einem Augenpaar,” M. 210.


Moldenhauer paraphrases a letter from Webern to Schoenberg of 13 June 1917 in
I believe the two orchestral songs have now gone successfully. One: “Wiese im Park” by Karl Kraus.\textsuperscript{106}

Webern claims to have received positive remarks from Schoenberg regarding these orchestral songs, and Webern obviously was pleased with his compositional progress when he again wrote of these settings in a letter to Berg later that summer:

I have gone along the right paths. Schoenberg has confirmed this. Now I am writing quite differently. I have composed four orchestral songs. Homogeneous sounds, in part long themes, altogether something entirely different from before the war. I have felt this for some time. Now when I could have proceeded so well with my work, I must be in the theater . . . . My conscience bothers me. It is our duty to compose.”\textsuperscript{107}

“Wiese im Park” first appeared in Die Fackel in December 1915\textsuperscript{108} and later was published in volume 1 of Worte in Versen. It is the first Kraus poem that Webern set to music and the only one for which he published a setting; it appears as the first of the Four Songs, op. 13, published in 1926. “Wiese im Park” is also the only Kraus poem that Webern ever mentioned specifically by name in his correspondence. With the setting of

\begin{flushleft}
which Webern writes that he had brought along to Klagenfurt the scores of Pierrot Lunaire, op. 21, Erwartung, op. 17, and Das Buch der hängenden Gärten, op. 15, and reports to his mentor that “I am occupying myself almost exclusively with your music. Every day I play in these works.” Chronicle, 266; Chronik, 240. “[Ich] bin fast ausnahmslos mit Deiner Musik beschäftigt . . . . Jeden Tag spiele ich in diesen Werken.”

\end{flushleft}

\textsuperscript{106}Letter from Webern to Berg, 1 July 1917. Briefly excerpted in Rode, Alban Berg und Karl Kraus, 393. “Jetzt sind mir zwei Orchesterlieder, glaub ich, gut gelungen. Eins: ‘Wiese im Park’ von Karl Kraus.” Shreffler identifies the two orchestral songs in this letter as op. 13 no. 1 and op. 14 no. 4; see Lyric Impulse, 66 n. 2.


\textsuperscript{108}Nos. 413-17 (10 December 1945): 128.
this poem Webern continued on a decade-long preoccupation with song composition that had begun in 1915. Webern also set the poetry of Bethge, Goethe, Rosegger, and Strindberg during this ten-year period, but only the poetry of Georg Trakl figures more prominently than that of Kraus. Table 2.1 provides the names, sources, and earliest dates of composition for the six Kraus poems set by Webern.

As the table indicates, in most cases Webern began working with each poem within roughly one year after it appeared in Die Fackel. One exception, “Vision des Erblindeten,” did not appear in Die Fackel at all but rather was first published in the third volume of Worte in Versen (1918). It is possible that this poem was not included in Die Fackel due to government censorship during the war years, although Kraus and his journal suffered much less government interference that did many other periodicals. The only surviving compositional manuscript for “Vision des Erblindeten” is a continuity draft dated in the summer of the following year. In this one instance Webern must have lifted the poem from a volume of Worte in Versen, even though none of these volumes is listed in his library catalog. The extant compositional materials for Webern’s settings of “In tiefster Schuld vor einem Augenpaar,” which was, in fact, the first Kraus poem to be published in Die Fackel, are dated nine years after the poem’s first publication. The fragmentary sketches for “Mutig trägst du die Last” were not dated by the composer, but one sketch appears on the reverse side of a draft of another work known to have originated in 1924.

Lyrical Nature of the Poems Webern Chose

A study of the Kraus poems that Webern chose suggests that he carefully selected poems that shared common characteristics and that he may have made such decisions

---

109 Webern’s settings of Trakl’s poetry have been thoroughly discussed in Shreffler, Lyric Impulse.

In the third column (Worte in Versen) the lower of the two entries refers to the page in volume 7 of Kraus’s collected works; see Werke von Karl Kraus, ed. Heinrich Fischer, 14 vols. (Munich: Kösel, 1959).

The provenance of this poem was unknown for many years, and it is therefore referenced by the poem’s first line in Moldenhauer’s biography and other works. The published manuscript catalog of the PSS Webern Collection lists the sketch series twice, once under each of the titles provided above; see Felix Meyer and Sabine Hänggi-Stampfli, eds., Anton Webern Manuskripte, 20, 21. I will refer to the poem by its first line, abbreviated as “In tiefster Schuld.” This poem was first published under the title “Widmung des Werkes,” but it appeared in the first volume of Worte in Versen as “Widmung des Wortes.” The poem was identified by Anne Shreffler, who also discovered a second fragmentary setting. See Lyric Impulse, 60 n. 53.

Since the provenance of this poem was also unknown for many years, it is identified in Moldenhauer’s Chronicle, Shreffler’s works, and many other secondary sources by the poem’s first line, although it is actually titled “An eine Heilige” (To a Saint) and is called

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poem title</th>
<th>Die Fackel</th>
<th>Worte in Versen</th>
<th>Date set</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“In tiefster Schuld vor einem Augenpaar,” M. 210 [“Widmung des Wortes”]</td>
<td>no. 317-18</td>
<td>Vol. 1, 1916</td>
<td>1920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Wiese im Park (Schloß Janowitz)” op. 13 no. 1, M. 221</td>
<td>no. 413-17</td>
<td>Vol. 1, 1916</td>
<td>[Fall] 1916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Vallorbe” (Mai 1917),” M. 232</td>
<td>no. 472-73</td>
<td>Vol. III, 1918</td>
<td>June 1918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Flieder,” M. 246</td>
<td>no. 508-513</td>
<td>Vol. IV, 1919</td>
<td>1920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Mutig trägst du die Last,” M. 211 [“An eine Heilige”]</td>
<td>no. 588-94</td>
<td>Vol. VI, 1922</td>
<td>[1924]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

111 In the third column (Worte in Versen) the lower of the two entries refers to the page in volume 7 of Kraus’s collected works; see Werke von Karl Kraus, ed. Heinrich Fischer, 14 vols. (Munich: Kösel, 1959).

112 The provenance of this poem was unknown for many years, and it is therefore referenced by the poem’s first line in Moldenhauer’s biography and other works. The published manuscript catalog of the PSS Webern Collection lists the sketch series twice, once under each of the titles provided above; see Felix Meyer and Sabine Hänggi-Stampfli, eds., Anton Webern Manuskripte, 20, 21. I will refer to the poem by its first line, abbreviated as “In tiefster Schuld.” This poem was first published under the title “Widmung des Werkes,” but it appeared in the first volume of Worte in Versen as “Widmung des Wortes.” The poem was identified by Anne Shreffler, who also discovered a second fragmentary setting. See Lyric Impulse, 60 n. 53.

113 Since the provenance of this poem was also unknown for many years, it is identified in Moldenhauer’s Chronicle, Shreffler’s works, and many other secondary sources by the poem’s first line, although it is actually titled “An eine Heilige” (To a Saint) and is called...
with the purpose of creating a cycle of Kraus songs that would be organically linked by topic, character, and imagery. The poems that Webern chose represent only certain genres among the wide spectrum of Kraus’s poetic expression. A large proportion of Kraus’s poems are versified glosses or polemics, autobiographical excursions, satires, parodies, or poeticized versions of prose from *Die Fackel*, the latter of which depended on the reader’s being well acquainted with Kraus’s other writings. Many of his poems would be correctly categorized as overt social criticism, and these are often closely bound to contemporaneous personalities and events of Kraus’s era. Several Kraus scholars have referred to many of his poems as “Gedankenlyrik,” which Zohn defines as “poetry with a cargo of thought.” Zohn also described Kraus’s poetry as “seldom ‘romantic’ in the sense that they are products of poetic rapture or intoxication; rather, they spring from the rapture of language and logic.” Webern, however, was not drawn to the explicitly

114In her published dissertation Caroline Kohn arranged Kraus’s entire poetic oeuvre under the following ten categories: Women, Lust, and Love; Nature; Personal Philosophy; Artistic Language; Dreams; Social Justice; Clichés, Ink, and the Press; Technology and War; Vienna, Austria; Berlin, Germany. All of the poems chosen by Webern fit under the first two categories with the exception of “Vision des Erblindeten,” which she categorized under “Technology and War,” and “Widmung des Wortes,” which does not appear in her table. See Kohn, *Kraus als Lyriker*, 68-73.

115Wilma Abeles Iggers, who takes a decidedly dim view of Kraus’s poetry in general, wrote, “If one of the criteria for poetry is permanent value, most of Volume VII of *Worte in Versen* (and many other individual poems) must be discounted, because it deals for the most part with details of contemporary politics.” See Iggers, *Karl Kraus: Viennese Critic*, 12-15.


118Ibid.
critical or ideologically polemical texts among Kraus’s poetry—at least, he apparently did not consider such poetry appropriate for his musical settings. He selected, rather, only poems with a lyrical character, poems that were first-person contemplations of nature (“Wiese im Park,” “Vallorbe,” “Flieder”) or that might be interpreted as epitaphs (“In tiefster Schuld” and “Mutig”). The only Kraus poem set by Webern that might be construed to have overtly political content is “Vision des Erblindeten,” which is one of the poet’s numerous anti-war poems, but which is also addressed to “Mutter” and may have been attractive to Webern for that reason. The six Kraus poems Webern set to music are provided below, followed by English translations.

Wiese im Park
Schloß Janowitz119


Die vielen Glockenblumen! Horch und schau! Wie lange steht er schon auf diesem Stein, der Admiral. Es muß ein Sonntag sein und alles läutet blau.

Nicht weiter will ich. Eitler Fuß, mach Halt! Vor diesem Wunder ende deinen Lauf. Ein toter Tag schlägt seine Augen auf. Und alles bleibt so alt.

119 Schloß Janowitz was the estate of Sidonie von Nadherny. Images of the beautiful park on this estate, which served as a personal refuge for Kraus on many occasions, are often encountered in his poetry.
On the Franco-Swiss border, the town of Vallorbe is a stop on the TGV line between Paris and Lausanne. The town is in the 1000 meter high Vallée de Joux, a long thin valley sandwiched between the Grand Risoud forest, which conceals it from France, and the parallel Mont Tendre range, which cuts it off from Lake Geneva. The River Orbe flows through the valley, over which the 1483 meter high Dent de Vaulion looms in the southwest.

Meadow in the Park
Janowitz Mansion

How [all] becomes timeless to me. Returning transfixed
I stay and stand fixed on the meadow plane,
like the swan here in the green mirror.
And this was my land.

The many bluebells! Listen and look!
How long it stays on this stone,
the admiral-moth. It must be a Sunday
and everything rings in blue.

I wish [to go] no further. Idle foot, halt!
Before this wonder end your course.
A dead day opens its eyes.
And everything remains so old.

Vallorbe
Mai 1917

Du himmlisches Geflecht, du Glockenblumenkorb,
Ursprung der Orbe, der Welt, du unversehrtes Ziel,
du Wonnwort Vallorbe, das in den Mai mir fiel,
du Thal der Thäler du, traumtiefes Thal der Orbe!

Du Sonntag der Natur, hier seitab war die Ruh.
Ursprung der Zeit! So hat, da alles war geglückt,
der Schöpfer diesen Kuß der Schöpfung aufgedrückt,
hier saß der Gott am Weg zum guten lac de Joux.

Du Gnade, die verweht den niebesiegten Wahn,
wie anders war es da, und da entstand die Zeit,
dieweil sie staunend still stand vor der Ewigkeit.
Wie blau ist doch die Welt vom Schöpfer aufgethan!

120On the Franco-Swiss border, the town of Vallorbe is a stop on the TGV line between Paris and Lausanne. The town is in the 1000 meter high Vallée de Joux, a long thin valley sandwiched between the Grand Risoud forest, which conceals it from France, and the parallel Mont Tendre range, which cuts it off from Lake Geneva. The River Orbe flows through the valley, over which the 1483 meter high Dent de Vaulion looms in the southwest.
Vallorbe
May 1917

You heavenly tangle, you basket of bluebells,
Origin of the orb, of the world, you unscathed destination,
you blissful word Vallorbe, that came to me in May,
you valley of valleys, valley of the Orbe [that lies] deep in dream!

You Sunday of nature, here remote was rest.
Origin of time! There, after everything was accomplished,
the creator pressed this kiss on the creation,
here sat God on the way to good lake Joux.

You grace, who disperses the never-defeated delusion,
how different it was there, and there time began,
while it stood in astonished silence before eternity.
How blue the creator made the world!

Vision des Erblindeten

So, Mutter, Dank! So fühl’ ich deine Hand.
Oh, sie befreit von Nacht und Vaterland!
Ich athme Wald und heimatliches Glück.
Wie führst du mich in deinen Schoß zurück.

Nun ist der Donner dieser Nacht verrollt,
Ich weiß es nicht, was sie von mir gewollt.
O Mutter, wie dein guter Morgen thaut!
Schon bin ich da, wo Gottes Auge blaut.

Vision of the Blinded One

So, mother, thanks! Thus I feel your hand.
Oh, it frees me from night and the fatherland!
I breathe forest and native happiness.
How you guide me back to your bosom.

Now the thunder of this night is rolled away.
I do not know what it wanted from me.
Oh mother, how your good morning dews!
Already I am there, where God’s eye blues.
Widmung des Wortes

In tiefster Schuld vor einem Augenpaar,
worin ich schuf, was darin immer war,
geschaffen, kund zu tun, was es nicht weiß,
dem Himmel hilft es, macht der Hölle heiß.

In tiefster Ehrerbietung dem Gesicht,
das, Besseres verschweigend als es spricht,
ein Licht zurückstrahlt, das es nie erhellt,
der Welt geopfert, zaubert eine Welt.

Dedication of the Word

In deepest debt before a pair of eyes,
wherein I created, what was always there,
created, announcing what it does not know,
it helps heaven make hell hot.

In deepest deference to the face,
which, concealing better things than it speaks of,
reflects a light that never illuminated it,
sacrificed to the world, it conjures up a world.

Flieder

Nun weiß ich doch, ‘s ist Frühling wieder.
Ich sah es nicht vor so viel Nacht
und lange hatt’ ich’s nicht gedacht.
Nun merk’ ich erst, schon blüht der Flieder.

Wie fand ich das Geheimnis wieder?
Man hatte mich darum gebracht.
Was hat die Welt aus uns gemacht!
Ich dreh’ mich um, da blüht der Flieder.

Und danke Gott, er schuf mich wieder,
indem er wiederschuf die Pracht.
Sie anzuschauen aufgewacht,
so bleib’ ich stehn. Noch blüht der Flieder.
Lilac

Now certainly I know that it is spring again.
I did not see it because of so much darkness
and for a long time I had not [even] imagined it.
Now I notice for the first time, [that] already the lilac is blooming.

How did I find the secret again?
It had been plucked from me.
What the world has made out of us!
I turn around, there the lilac is blooming.

And thank God, he recreated me,
in that he recreated the splendor.
To look, reawakened, at it,
so I remain standing. The lilac is still blooming.

An eine Heilige

Mutig trägst du die Last, daß sie die andern nicht drücke.
Liebend leihst du dein Licht allem was finster um dich.

Immer gibst du, als ob dein Sein allein nicht genügte —
dich zu wissen, beglückt mich mit dem herrlichsten Lohn.

Nimmer gibst du dich aus und einst wird selbst nicht im Himmel
so viel Huld für dich sein, wie du hienieden vergabst.

To a Saint

Courageously you carry the load, that it not burden the others.
Lovingly you lend your light to everything that is dark around you.

Always you give, as if your being alone were not enough —
to know you delights me with the most glorious reward.

You never promote yourself, and even in heaven there will never be
as much grace for you, as you bestowed here below.

One is struck by the simplicity of language and imagery in this poetry. The rhyme
schemes are also conventional—three quatrains of ABBA CDDC EFFE in “Wiese im
Park” and “Vallorbe,” and two quatrains of rhyming couplets (AABB CCDD) in “Vision
des Erblindeten” and “Widmung des Wortes.” “Flieder,” again in three quatrains of ABBA, is even simpler both in language and rhyme scheme, using only two rhyming sounds. Finally, “An eine Heilige” is constructed as an elegiac distich. In these poems Webern seems to have selected the most conservative examples among a strikingly conservative repertory. Kraus was self-admittedly an epigone, who reveled in the classical German poetic tradition of Goethe. He was also strongly impressed by Shakespeare, whose works he translated and to whom he made frequent references throughout his career. In the following excerpt from the poem Bekenntnis (Confession) Kraus militantly defended his stance as champion of the classical tradition:

Ich bin nur einer von den Epigonen,
die in dem alten Haus der Sprache wohnen.

Doch hab’ ich drin mein eigenes Erleben,
ich breche aus und ich zerstöre Theben.
Komm’ ich auch nach den alten Meistern, später,
so räch’ ich blutig das Geschick der Väter.

Von Rache sprech’ ich, will die Sprache rächen
an allen jenen, die die Sprache sprechen.

Bin Epigone, Ahnenwerthes Ahner.
Ihr aber seid die kundigen Thebaner!121

I am only one of the epigones,
who live in the old house of language.

Still I have therein my own experience,
I break out and destroy Thebes.

I come after the old masters, later,
so bloodily I avenge the fate of the fathers.

I speak of revenge, want to avenge language
against all those who speak the language.

[I] am an epigone, tribute-worthy payer of tribute.
But you are the clever Thebans.

According to Zohn and other sources, Kraus’s poetry was not fully appreciated by his contemporaries, and it was criticized as too unoriginal, intellectual, and “not elemental enough.” For Webern, who is known to have also set poems by Goethe between 1917 and 1920, as well as the folk-style texts of Rosegger, this conservative style was evidently an attractive quality.

Two Motifs: Ursprung and Sonntag

The Sonntag (Sunday) motif, a recurrent theme throughout all genres of Kraus’s oeuvre, appears in both “Wiese im Park” and “Vallorbe.” Sonntag appears in the middle stanza in each of these three-stanza poems, yet these poems demonstrate two different manifestations of this image, one deeply melancholic and the other an affirmation of the beauty of untainted creation. Typically, references to Sonntag or Sonntagsruhe (Sunday rest) in Kraus’s works emerge either as dark protests against the perversion of the Sabbath’s true meaning or as exaltations that celebrate the purity of original creation. For Kraus the ideal of Sonntag is closely bound with another very important concept and pervasive theme in his works, that of the Ursprung (origin), the

---

122 Zohn, Karl Kraus, 66; see also Franz Leschnitzer, “Der Fall Karl Kraus,” 59-82.

123 Webern worked with the Goethe poems “Gleich und Gleich” and “Gegenwart” in 1917, “Cirrus” in 1918, and “Christkindlein trägt die Sündern der Welt” in 1920. After the adoption of the twelve-tone method Webern turned to Goethe’s poems once again. In addition to the two Goethe poems that were published as op. 19, Moldenhauer lists sketches on four Goethe texts between 1926 and 1930, one of which was yet another attempt to set “Cirrus.” See Chronicle, 740-743.

124 For the best discussion of the Sonntag motif in Kraus’s poetry, see Werner Kraft, Karl Kraus, 239-48. Kraft traces the origin of this motif in poetry from Baudelaire through Rainer Maria Rilke to Kraus.

125 See Kraft’s interpretation of an aphorism from Sprüche und Widersprüche, in which Kraus provides a mocking description of a typical Sunday in Austria. Kraft, Karl Kraus, 240-41.
original or true form of man and all creation as conceived by the Creator.\footnote{Kraus’s conception of Ursprung has been attributed to the Judaic myth that contrasts the purity of original Creation with the fallen state of man; see Berthold Viertel, Dichtungen und Dokumente (Munich: Kösel, 1956), 264. Timms also draws convincing parallels between Kraus’s concept of Ursprung and ideas found in fourteenth-century sermons of the Dominican monk Johannes Tauler; see Apocalyptic Satirist, 231.}

The concept of Ursprung was very attractive to Webern and almost certainly influenced his decision to set “Vallorbe” to music. Webern would have first read Kraus’s references to Ursprung in Die Fackel, and he apparently encountered the concept again in April 1914 at one of Kraus’s lectures. As mentioned earlier, while traveling with his father, Webern wrote to Berg that he would attend a Kraus lecture in Vienna.\footnote{Letter from Webern to Berg, 22 April 1914. Quoted by Rode, “Anton Webern und Karl Kraus,” 315.} In a letter to Schoenberg on the day after the lecture Webern related the Ursprung to the idea of timelessness,\footnote{Letter from Webern to Schoenberg, 23 April 1914. Quoted by Rode, “Anton Webern und Karl Kraus,” 323. An excerpt from this letter was provided on p. 54.} a principle that was made explicit in Kraus’s writings and that is also shared in the poems “Wiese im Park” and “Vallorbe.” Ursprung is the sphere of the soul, the spiritual realm towards which Kraus oriented himself and which is diametrically opposed to the corruption of a world that has fallen from grace. In the poem “Der sterbende Mensch” (“The Dying Man”),\footnote{Worte in Versen, I; Werke, VII, 57-59.} which is presented as a poetic dialogue between the Man, the Conscience, the World, and various other interlocutors, in the last stanza God himself assures the dying man, “Du bleibst am Ursprung. Ursprung ist das Ziel (You remain at the origin. The origin is the destination).” For Kraus the Ursprung is eternal and predates the beginning of time and creation, yet its representation in this world has been corrupted, primarily through the pernicious misuse of language. Most insidious among the symptoms of this corruption is the adulteration of Sonntag. The first line of “Wiese im Park” immediately evokes the realm of the timeless (zeitlos). As in “Vallorbe,” it is the poetic persona’s reaction to a landscape, to nature itself, that has
induced this state, yet unlike “Vallorbe” the timeless state is not a real-time experience but only a memory. The retrospective aspect of this poem is immediately apparent, for the poetic persona is “Rückwärts hingebannt” (held back), and at the end of the first stanza the verb is past tense, “Und dieses war mein Land.” In Kraft’s engaging and original discussion of this poem, he interpreted the timelessness and the recognition of Sonntag (“Es muß ein Sonntag sein”) in the second stanza as recollections of childhood, citing a similar evocation of Sonntag in the poem “Alle Vögel sind schon da” from the second volume of Worte in Versen (Werke, VII, 70). In that poem the monotony of Sonntag is recalled as the happiest of childhood memories. Although the Ursprung is not explicitly articulated in “Wiese im Park,” the appearances of timelessness and Sonntag make the allusion clear. The evocation of Sonntag and the Ursprung fails, however, in the final stanza, when present reality dispels the illusion. The first two lines of the final stanza reveal that it is the poet himself who turns away from his revelry, returning to a darker world, symbolized by the disturbing imagery of a dead day that opens its eyes and is old once again. It is difficult to avoid a biographical interpretation of this poem. Kraus, the admitted epigone who looks to the past, toward the Ursprung, knew the futility of attempting to transpose that purity into the modern, decaying world. “Wiese im Park,” with its evocation of the irretrievable ideal Sonntag, perfectly expresses the pathos of Kraus’s verse in general, as described by Kraft:

> The tragedy of his lyrics lies in the fact that under the pressure of reality the revocation fails in the end. The knowledge concerning the rest of the seventh day comes from a legacy of the old world, which he passes on, not in anticipation of harmonizing the inconsistency, but as a pure contrast that he comes to identify with the sickness of the new world. He knows with absolute certainty that he himself could not preserve it in its purity without giving room to falsehood. 

---

130 Kraft, Karl Kraus, 245.

131 Kraft, Karl Kraus, 242. “Das Tragische seiner Lyrik liegt darin, daß unter dem Druck der Realität die Zurücknahme schließlich mißlingt. Das Wissen um die Ruhe des siebenten Tages stammt aus einem Vermächtnis der alten Welt, das er weitergibt, aber nicht als vorweggenommene Harmonisierung einer Unstimmigkeit, sondern als reines Gegenbild, von welchem er, hineinwachsend in das Unheil der neuen Welt, mit
The positive dimension of this “pure contrast” is celebrated in the poem “Vallorbe.” The poem is an exaltation of beauty and the purity of original creation, inspired by the poetic persona’s direct experience of a dramatic Alpine landscape. Here the purity of nature is again associated with the timeless Ursprung, yet in this poem the mystical experience of the poetic persona is depicted as the only reality. Kraus’s declamatory “Du Sonntag der Natur, hier seitab was die Ruh” harkens back to the origin of the Sabbath, the day on which God rested from the world’s creation.

Blue as an Image of the Divine

The first and last lines of “Vallorbe,” “Du himmlisches Geflecht, du Glockenblumenkorb [basket of bluebells],” and “Wie blau ist doch die Welt vom Schöpfer aufgethan!” provide two of several references to the color blue in the Kraus poems that Webern chose to set. On one level the imagery may be interpreted simply as representing metaphorically the lake and rivers of the landscape, over which the blue of the sky is presumed (but not explicitly said) to predominate. The color also has a more important symbolic value, however, for when one compares these occurrences to other appearances of this color in Kraus’s poetry, one notes that it is consistently used in connection with divine imagery. Another very similar landscape poem, “Fahrt ins Fextal,” (“Journey in the Fextal”) begins with a couplet that makes this connection

unbedingter Sicherheit weiß, daß selbst er es in seiner Reinheit nicht bewahren könnte, ohne der Lüge Raum zu geben.”

132“Blau” is one of the many color words that repeatedly appear in Trakl’s poetry. Trakl’s “Verklärung,” three fragmentary settings of which Webern created in 1917 (M. 225; he ultimately created 6 fragmentary settings), contains “Blaue Blume” which also “sound” in the last stanza.

Blaue Blume, Blue flower, Die leise tönt in vergilbtem That softly sounds in yellowed Gestein. Stone.

Shreffler contends that the reference to blue flowers in Trakl’s work alludes to Novalis. See Lyric Impulse, 30-31.

133 Worte in Versen, II; Werke, VII, 67.
Als deine Sonne meinen Schnee beschien,
ein Sonntag wars im blauen Engadin.

When your sun shone on my snow,
it was a Sunday in the blue Engadine.\[134\]

Here, blue is associated again with Sonntag, even as in “Vallorbe” it is related to Sonntag, the Creator, and the Ursprung. Similarly, “Wiese im Park” is replete with blue imagery, again in connection with the divine realm; there are the “many bluebells” that join all of nature on Sonntag and “ring in blue.” The use of this hue also links “Vision des Erblindeten” to these poems. At the end of that poem the stricken and perhaps dying or dead soldier, who, not insignificantly, has become blind to the physical world, now resides in that realm where God’s eye shines blue. Interestingly, Kraus himself was once depicted by the poet Georg Trakl as a figure clad in blue armour. Trakl dedicated the following aphorism, entitled “Psalm,” to Kraus, not long after they met in 1913:

Weißer Hohepriester der Wahrheit,
Kristallne Stimme, in der Gottes eisiger Odem wohnt,
Zürnender Magier,
Dem unter flammendem Mantel der blaue Panzer des Kriegers kliert.

White high priest of truth,
Crystalline voice, wherein dwells the icy breath of God,
Angry magician,
Beneath whose flaming robe clashes the blue armor of the warrior.\[135\]

Even though the reference to “blue armor” in this aphorism is not as explicitly related to the divine as the images previously discussed in Kraus’s own poetry, the title of the poem and reference to Kraus as priest does suggest a similar connotation. Other references to

\[134\]Engadine is the valley of the River Inn in eastern Switzerland.

\[135\]This poem first appeared in Ludwig von Ficker’s journal Der Brenner, III (15 June 1913): 840. It was reprinted in Trakl, Das dichterische Werk (Munich: Deutscher Taschenbuch Verlag, 1987), 68. Kraus was one of Trakl’s most important advocates. The image of the blue-clad warrior in Trakl’s poem brings to mind the journal Der blaue Reiter (The Blue Rider), edited by Kandinsky and Franz Marc, the title of which also has a military connotation.
blue in Trakl’s poetry, a poetry that contains many colorful adjectives, are not consistently related to the divine, and it seems that the relationship of blue to divinity is a part of Kraus’s personal symbolic language.

Nature Imagery in the Poems

Other than the references to blue, the only other color to be found in the six Kraus poems chosen by Webern is the single reference in “Wiese im Park” to the color green, easily recognizable as a symbol of nature. In the first stanza of “Wiese im Park” the poetic persona stands astounded by the spectacle of pure nature. In this timeless encounter with the ineffable the poet does not merely witness the swan, he refers to himself as “standing fixed in the meadow as a swan here in the green mirror.” Going well beyond a mere description of natural phenomena, the poet experiences an enraptured glimpse of his own true aspect, beautiful as a swan, reflected in and a part of nature itself. Despite the fact that the memory of the experience fades in the last stanza, leaving the day—and by extension the poet—old once again, the first two stanzas describe a profound encounter with the Ursprung of nature, and this a probably the most important reason that Webern chose the poem. The nature imagery in “Wiese im Park,” “Vallorbe,” and “Flieger” would of course appeal to Webern’s almost mystical reverence for nature, especially since the poems describe very personal and direct experiences. The mention of specific flowers in this poetry—campanula (bluebells) in “Wiese im Park” and “Vallorbe,” and lilacs in “Flieger”—also would have been attractive to Webern, as is well known to anyone who is familiar with the composer’s biography. Webern took great joy in flowers, especially the mountain varieties, and his correspondence and diaries contain

\[136\]

Allen Forte, in his unsympathetic treatment of Kraus’s poem, criticized the inclusion of the word “hier” as “inserted . . . merely to maintain the metric scheme” that “is unrelentingly trochaic.” I would argue, however, that Kraus included “hier” to distinguish clearly that the poetic persona is not merely describing an observed natural image, the swan over “there” and thus separate from himself, but that he is describing himself “here” as the swan (a natural symbol of beauty) reflected in the green mirror of nature. The accentuation of the vocal line of op. 13 no. 1 suggests an iambic reading of the poem. See Forte, The Atonal Music of Anton Webern, 279.
numerous detailed descriptions of the flowers that he encountered on his natural outings. He also used pressed flowers as page markers in his books.\textsuperscript{137}

**Images of Motherhood**

The images of motherhood, explicit in “Vision des Erblindeten” (“So, Mutter, Dank!” and “Wie führst du mich in deinem Schoß zurück”) and readily inferred in “Mutig,” may have attracted Webern to these poems. The composer’s mother had died in September 1907 at the age of 53. The composer grieved deeply for her for many years, and references to her in his diaries and correspondence confide that many of his works were conceived in her memory. For example, on 17 July 1912 Webern wrote to Schoenberg:

> I would like to tell you that the grief for my mother grows within me more and more. Almost all my compositions have originated in her memory. It is always the same thing that I want to express. I bring it to her as a sacrificial offering. The love of a mother is the highest form of love.\textsuperscript{138}

Although “In tiefster Schuld” is dedicated to Annie Kalmar, the young actress with whom Kraus had a well-documented infatuation and who died in 1901 at the age of 23, Webern certainly may have interpreted this poem in reference to his late mother, as well.\textsuperscript{139} The reference to *Mutter* in “Vision des Erblindeten” might also be interpreted simultaneously as an image of the Virgin Mary, who is often associated with the color blue—especially since this maternal “vision” appears to a soldier who is mortally wounded. The religious implications of this poem would not have been lost on the devout composer.

\textsuperscript{137}See for example Moldenhauer, *Chronicle*, 77-78, 158, 200-201, 203, 231.

\textsuperscript{138}Moldenhauer, *Chronicle*, 83; *Chronik*, 71. “Ich möchte Dir auch noch sagen, daß der Schmerz um meine Mutter in mir nur immer wächst. In der Erinnerung an sie sind fast alle meine Kompositionen entstanden. Es ist immer dasselbe, was ich ausdrücken will. Ich bringe es Ihr als Opfer dar. Die Mutterliebe ist das Höchste; die Liebe der Mutter.”

\textsuperscript{139}Kraus’s own mother died in 1891, when he was 16 years old; whether Webern was aware that he and Kraus shared this tragic circumstance is not known.
Webern’s Later Reception of Kraus, 1926 to 1936

Webern, Kraus, Hildegard Jone

After the publication of “Wiese im Park” as the first of the *Four Songs*, op. 13, in 1926, there are no subsequent references to Kraus’s poetry in Webern’s extant correspondence. He did continue to be an avid reader of *Die Fackel*, however, and references to Kraus and his writings are scattered throughout his correspondence and the memoirs of his contemporaries. Webern’s second daughter, Maria Halbich-Webern, recalled that the latest edition of *Die Fackel* was always positioned in a particular place in the family home. Maria was born in February 1913, so her memories surely reflected most strongly the post-World War I period. Several of Webern’s students from the 1920s related that the composer frequently paraphrased Kraus, and that Webern considered Kraus’s views on the correct approach to language to be directly applicable to musical composition. Peter Stadlen recalled that during his coaching sessions with Webern in 1927, in preparation for the premiere of the *Variationen für Klavier*, op. 27, the composer “kept referring to the melody which, he said, must be as telling as a spoken sentence.” Friedrich Deutsch, who was also one of Webern’s students, likewise pointed to Kraus’s ethical views as a primary influence on Webern:

“The primeval source of musical experience is the tone,” said Webern. “The individual sound is the latent force of all development.” Webern explained why the question of the next step was all-important. It concerned the immediate rise or fall of the tone-line in the making. The logical evolution of all music thus depended on the correct answer to these earliest steps. Webern quoted the statement of Karl Kraus that the fate of humanity often depended on the correctly placed comma. Webern considered the transference of this idea—from language

---

140 Related by Susanne Rode, who interviewed Maria Halbich-Webern; see “Anton Webern und Karl Kraus,” 315.

141 Several accounts of Webern’s teaching are found in Moldenhauer, 505-14.

Hans Swarowsky, who studied music theory with Schoenberg and Webern between 1920 and 1927, wrote that Webern would also quote “Karl Kraus, who for us all was something of a representative of the conscience, a silent guardian of the honesty of our thought.” Webern had internalized the ethical imperative in Kraus’s concept of language, even as his method of composition and his circle of associates went through significant changes during the third decade of the century.

During the decade between 1926 and Kraus’s death in 1936 Webern’s reception of the satirist was undoubtedly influenced by the composer’s increasingly close relationship with the poet and painter Hildegard Jone. Jone, whom Webern first met at the Hagenbund in 1926, was herself a dedicated reader of *Die Fackel*. According to Lauriejean Reinhardt, Jone’s extant personal library contains “what appears to be a complete run of *Die Fackel*” and numerous other books by or about Kraus. Jone was also an enthusiastic visitor at Kraus’s lectures; between December 1920 and June 1928 Jone collected 38 programs from his public readings, including 11 from the month

---


145 The Hagenbund or Künstlerbund Hagen was an association of progressive painters and sculptors to which Josef Humplik (Jone’s husband) belonged; see Moldenhauer, *Chronicle*, 341, 669 n. 12. For the most complete discussion of all aspects of Jone’s relationship with Webern see Lauriejean Reinhardt’s impressive dissertation, “From Poet’s Voice to Composer’s Muse: Text and Music in Webern’s Jone Settings” (Ph.D. diss., University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 1995).

146 Reinhardt, 83-84.
between 8 October and 7 November 1925. She obviously continued to visit Kraus lectures up to his death, because in her letter to the painter Albert Bloch on 12 July 1936 she commented that she had a seat in the first row at the last lecture, where she found it “extremely touching” (“so überaus rührend”) to have Kraus talk down to her alone.

Others of Jone’s letters written to Bloch, who was himself a Kraus admirer, between 1935 and 1961 also maintain a generally positive assessment of Kraus.

Jone also evidenced her admiration for Kraus in several poems written in the 1920s. Some of these poems, one of which is named after Kraus and another of which explicitly refers to him, praise him as a critic and expositor of evil, as in the following poem published in Ludwig von Ficker’s journal Der Brenner in 1928:

Karl Kraus
Er löscht uns aus?
Ist’s zu ertragen, daß wir nicht aus Gottes Samen?
Er nennt den Bösen immer nur bei unserm Namen
und treibt ihn aus Leben aus.

147According to Rode, the Kraus lecture programs and ticket stubs are preserved in the Universität Innsbruck, Forschungsinstitut “Brenner-Archiv” in Innsbruck, Austria. See Rode, “Gedanken über Kunst,” 4594. Rode’s article, “Gedanken über Kunst,” provides several pieces of evidence that convincingly attest to Jone’s interest in Kraus; one piece of information, however, is apparently incorrect. Reinhardt contends that Rode has misread the letter from Webern to Jone dated 26 May 1941; Rode thought that Webern was thanking Jone for a selection of poetry entitled “Unbekannten Kraus” (Unknown Kraus), but according to Reinhardt the collection is entitled “Unbekannten Kern” (Unknown Kernels). See Rode, “Gedanken über Kunst,” 4594; Reinhardt, 472 n. 29, 502.


149Der Brenner was founded by the editor and poet Ludwig von Ficker (1880-1967) and essayist Carl Dallago (1869-1949) in Innsbruck in 1910 and was published irregularly until 1954. As young men Ficker and Dallago were strongly influenced by Karl Kraus, and they conceived their journal as a close corollary to Die Fackel. Many writers who contributed to Die Fackel found a second home in Der Brenner after Kraus stopped accepting submissions in 1911. See Gerald Stieg, Der Brenner und die Fackel, 20-21.

150Der Brenner 12 (1928): 126. Reinhardt interpreted this poem from the perspective
He obliterates us?
Is it to be endured, that we are not of God’s seed?
He always names evil by our name alone
and exorcizes it from life.

Others of Jone’s poems demonstrate her awareness of Kraus’s views on gender issues. Reinhardt has described how Jone’s poem “Der Dichter und das Madchen,” published in 1918,\(^{151}\) seems to concur with Kraus’s misogynist view of women as sensuous by nature but “essentially passive and incapable of creative achievement.”\(^{152}\) Jone’s poems from the mid- to late-1920s, however, adopt a more critical view of Kraus’s concept of the feminine gender; while accepting Kraus’s depiction of women as more susceptible to emotion and the unconscious, she came to exalt this quality as a divine asset. Jone’s adoption of a more positive view of women as creative artists was an essential element in Ludwig von Ficker’s attraction to her poetry.\(^{153}\)

---

\(^{151}\)This poem was published on p. 6 of a collection entitled *Ring, mein Bewustsein!* appearing in *Das neue Gedicht* (Vienna: Verlag des Ver!, 1918), 3-18. Appendix 5 of Reinhardt’s dissertation (pp. 552-54) provides Jone’s complete publication history.

\(^{152}\)Reinhardt, 103. For a comparative analysis of the gender views of Jone and Kraus, see Reinhardt, 100-105. Page 102 of Reinhardt’s dissertation reproduces three of Jone’s gender poems, two of which make explicit mention of Kraus. For other discussions of Kraus’s views on women, see Janik and Toulmin, *Wittgenstein’s Vienna*, 70-77; Timms, *Apocalyptic Satirist*, 63-93. For an interesting overview of and perspective on *fin-de-siècle* perspectives on women and sexuality in general, see Bram Dijkstra, *Idols of Perversity: Fantasies of Feminine Evil in Fin-de-Siècle Culture* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986).

\(^{153}\)After an early history of antifeminist views that were undoubtedly influenced by Kraus and Weininger, Ficker realigned his journal on the belief that women possessed the greatest receptivity to spirituality and the greatest gift for poetry. This led Ficker to greatly emphasize the poetry of women in *Der Brenner* after 1926. His decision to promote female poets has been interpreted as signaling a desire to distance himself from the antifeminist views of Kraus and Weininger. See Walter Methlagl, “Woge und Kristall: Georg Trakl–Hildegard Jone–Anton Webern,” *Das Fenster* 42 (1987): 4131-32;
published many of her poems in *Der Brenner* and championed her, along with Paula Schlier, as ideal examples of the uniquely poetic genius of women.\(^{154}\)

Webern had read *Der Brenner* intermittently even before the First World War—for instance, he is known to have read the special Karl Kraus issues in 1913, to which Schoenberg had contributed, and several of the Georg Trakl poems that Webern set to music first appeared in that journal between 1913 and 1915.\(^{155}\) His interest in the journal gained new impetus, however, after his association with Jone. Letters to Ludwig von Ficker concerning Webern’s enthusiastic response to *Der Brenner* are found in Jone’s correspondence:

Ellenbogen and Dr. von Webern are enthusiastic about the new *Brenner*.\(^{156}\)

Today I have already received a marvelous letter from Anton v. Webern, pleased concerning *Der Brenner*.\(^{157}\)

Jone’s correspondence also provides evidence of Ficker’s interest in the creative interaction of Jone and Webern, as in the following letter concerning an opera libretto

---


\(^{155}\) Rode, “Gedanken über Kunst,” 4593-94; Reinhardt, 70-75. For an excellent overview of Ficker’s changing views on the subject of women as creative artists, see his letter to Jone from late June 1928 in Ignaz Zangerle et al., eds., *Ludwig von Ficker: Briefwechsel 1926-1939* (Innsbruck: Haymon, 1991), 119-22.


that Webern requested from Jone:

I am eager about the opera texts for Webern. Regarding this particular task, I have great confidence in you. Likewise, it speaks tremendously for the composer Webern’s inner perceptive to the characteristic sound-world of your poetic creation that he has approached you with this request. Here is an agreement from which you both may benefit.\textsuperscript{158}

Webern came into personal contact with Ficker through Jone,\textsuperscript{159} and Ficker later invited the composer to contribute to a memorial volume to Kraus shortly after his death.\textsuperscript{160} It was also through his association with Jone that Webern became acquainted with the Christian existentialist writings of Ferdinand Ebner\textsuperscript{161} and Theodor Haecker,\textsuperscript{162} both of


\textsuperscript{159}Webern may have met Ficker at a meeting in Vienna on 4 May 1928, which also included Humplik and Kraus; see Ignaz Zangerle et al., eds., \textit{Ludwig von Ficker: Briefwechsel}, 383 n. 117.

\textsuperscript{160}According to Reinhardt, Webern mentioned Ficker’s proposal in a letter to Jone dated 23 June 1936; see Reinhardt, 66. The Kraus memorial volume of \textit{Der Brenner} was never published.

\textsuperscript{161}Jone hoped to introduce the philosopher Ferdinand Ebner to Webern on several occasions, but Ebner died in 1931 before a meeting occurred. References to proposed meetings between Ebner and Webern are found in Ebner’s diary entries from 21 October 1929 and 11 and 18 June 1931; see \textit{Ferdinand Ebner Schriften}, ed. Franz Seyr, vol. 2 (Munich: Kösel, 1963-65), 1026, 1033; see also Jone’s letter to Ebner on 16 June 1931 in \textit{Schriften}, vol. 3, 743. For information on Jone’s relationship with Ebner, see \textit{Schriften}, vol. 3, 626 and 764-70. Webern may have been exposed to Ebner’s writings through his contributions to \textit{Der Brenner}, but the composer became actively interested in Ebner’s writings only in the 1930s, after Jone had become the executor of Ebner’s literary Nachlaß and began to edit the philosopher’s works; see Reinhardt, 118 n. 10. Webern’s letters to Jone and Humplik contain at least eight references to Ebner, the first dating from 21 April 1934 and the last from 17 December 1938; see \textit{Anton Webern: Letters}, 25, 37; \textit{Anton Webern: Briefe}, 26, 29. Reinhardt’s dissertation has a section titled “Influence of Ferdinand Ebner,” pp. 89-95. The only writer besides Reinhardt to look at the connection between Webern, Jone, and Ebner is Sigrid Weismann in
whom were contributors to Der Brenner and were intimate associates of the journal’s editor and of Jone.

Webern’s renewed interest in Der Brenner in the late 1920s and early 1930s coincided with an overtly Catholic phase of the journal’s development. This stage of development placed great emphasis on religious poetry, especially the works of women poets and most particularly those of Hildegard Jone. Indeed, it was in Der Brenner that Webern found the texts for both his Three Songs, op. 23, and Das Augenlicht, op. 26; these texts appeared in “Viae inviae,” Jone’s requiem cycle to Ebner, published in the fall 1932 issue of Ficker’s journal. Through his friendship with Jone, Webern entered the Brenner circle at a time when Ficker was freeing himself from spiritual bondage to Kraus, as is professed in his letters to Jone from 1927 and 1928. As was the case with many Kraus enthusiasts from the pre-war years, the Brenner writers had reevaluated


162 Webern concluded the final “Path to the New Music” lecture by extolling Haeker as “one of the most wonderful thinkers of our times” and quoting from Haeker’s Vergil, Vater des Abendlands (Leipzig: Jakob Hegner, 1931). See The Path to the New Music, ed. Willi Reich, trans. Leo Black (London and Vienna: Universal Edition, 1975), 41; in German as Der Weg zur Neuen Musik (Vienna: Universal Edition, 1960), 44.

163 The Catholic orientation of the journal after 1926 coincided with the journal’s period of greatest popularity. This is also the period that immediately followed Dallago’s disassociation with the journal; see Allan Janik, “Carl Dallago and the Early Brenner,” Modern Austrian Literature 11 (1978): 1-18.

164 Reinhardt, 153, 537, 539-40.

165 Walter Methlagl asserts that Webern’s creative collaboration with Jone may have helped the composer break away from the domineering influence of Schoenberg. We must remember, however, that by the time Webern met Jone he was in his 40s, had published more than two dozen major works, and had developed a style that was distinct from that of Schoenberg. See Methlagl, “Woge und Kristall,” 4131-32.

166 Rode quotes long excerpts from these letters and discusses the evolving relationship of Ficker to Kraus in “Gedanken über Kunst,” 4592-93.
their relationship with Kraus and had come to find his satire and apocalyptic predictions of decline too pessimistic and sterile. Although the aesthetic ideals of Ficker, Jone, and Webern clearly incorporated the Krausian belief in a purified and moral foundation of language, the writings of Ebner and Haecker provided a model of language that was affirmative and expressed faith in the possibility of salvation. The post-1925 Brenner writers also cultivated an approach to language grounded in a vital and experiential Christianity that was far removed from Kraus’s predictions of decay and impending collapse. In the following excerpt from a 1940 essay Jone fuses a Krausian view of *das Wort* as *Ursprung* with a Christian ethos typical of her mature works:

The word creates. The lie, the degenerate word, destroys. The word that man has created has been expressed to him by the mouth of Christ. The lie has crucified the word. *That man is susceptible to the word of God is due to Man’s Godlikeness.* The sanctity of man to the word means obedience.

Although there is little in the extant correspondence to document how Webern’s reception of Kraus might have been affected by Jone and the Brenner circle, we may be certain that Kraus was a frequent topic of conversation among them. It is likely that Reinhardt’s analysis of Jone’s indebtedness to and transcendence of Kraus also describes Webern’s own mature reception of the satirist:

167 Of course, many former enthusiasts also reevaluated Kraus for political reasons. For discussions of Kraus’s activities and reputation before and after the war years, see Zohn “Trakl, Kraus and the Brenner Circle,” in *Internationales Georg Trakl-Symposium, Albany, N. Y.*, ed. Joseph Strelka (Berlin: Peter Lang, 1984), 150-51; Stieg, *Der Brenner und Die Fackel*, 67-77; Field, *The Last Days of Mankind*, 139-92; and Bilke, *Zeitgenossen der “Fackel”*, 257-60.

168 From the collection *Die Welt is Krank/Advent 1940*, p. 6, in the anthology *Die Welt is Krank* (PSS Jone Collection, no. 7). Quoted and translated by Reinhardt, 111. Reinhardt wrote that this poem “speaks directly to the deterioration of culture and language and more subtly to the evils of National Socialism,” pointing to the use of the word “entartete” as a clear reference to the National Socialist agenda regarding “entartete Kunst.” “Das Wort erschafft. Die Lüge, das entartete Wort, vernichtet. Das Wort, das den Menschen erschaffen hat, hat ihn angesprochen aus dem Munde Jesu. Die Lüge hat das Wort gekreuzigt. *Daß der Mensch ansprechbar ist vom Worte Gottes ist des menschen Gottesähnlichkeit.* Gehorsam ist des Menschen Ebenbildlichkeit mit dem Wort.”
Like Kraus, who equated language with truth and who ultimately eschewed the expressionist idiom as nonsensical “anti-grammar,” Jone returned in her later works to a traditional idiom. Bolstered by the writings of Ebner as well as Kraus, Jone advocated a purified and revivified approach to language—not simply a reversion to the traditional rules of syntax and semantics, but a rediscovery of linguistic truth based on an experiential understanding of logos. . . . Jone’s return to a more conventional syntax and her renewed faith in the validity of language and logos reflect her mature interest in divine order, or what in her conversations with Webern was referred to as “natural law.”

In Webern’s last references to Kraus, found in his Der Weg (The Path) lectures of the early 1930s, it was this concept of “natural law” that was to become the most important feature of his later reception of Kraus.

Kraus and Webern’s Der Weg zur neuen Musik Lectures

In the three series of lectures that Webern presented between January 1932 and April 1935 he frequently drew analogies between music and language, and, although Goethe was by far the literary authority most often cited, the composer also frequently referenced Karl Kraus. At the end of the last lecture of the first series, “Der Weg zur Komposition in 12 Tönen” (The Path to Twelve-Tone Composition), Webern cites Shakespeare and Kraus as literary examples of his most salient points:

Finally I must point out to you that this is not only so in music. One finds an analogy in language. I was delighted to find that such connections can also be observed in Shakespeare, in many alliterations and assonances. He even turns a phrase backwards. Karl Kraus’s handling of language is also based on this; unity also has to be created there, since it enhances comprehensibility.

---

169 Reinhardt, 110-11.


171 Webern, Path, 56; Weg, 61. “Zum Schluß muß ich aufmerksam machen, daß das nicht nur in der Musik so ist. Eine Analogie findet man in der Sprache. Mit höchster Begeisterung hat es mich erfüllt, daß bei Shakespeare in den vielen Anlauten und
The paired references to Shakespeare and Kraus might be in part attributable to the recent publication of Kraus’s translations of Shakespeare’s sonnets and drama, which appeared between 1930 and 1935.172 Here Webern invoked these eminent figures as universally well-known authorities to validate his all-important concepts of Zusammenhang (unity) and Faßlichkeit (comprehensibility).173 These terms appear repeatedly in the first lecture series, as Webern provided examples of how Bach, Beethoven, Brahms, Schoenberg, and others sought to create unity and comprehensibility in their own works.

During this cursory overview of music history, which he clearly saw as teleologically oriented towards the advent of twelve-tone composition, Webern repeatedly proclaims that “music is language” (“Die Musik ist Sprache”),174 it is from this point that the first lecture of the second series, “Der Weg zur Neuen Musik,” began:

Here I want to refer to Karl Kraus’s essay on language in the last issue of Die Fackel. Everything in it can be taken literally as applying to music. . . . In the last sentence he even says about language, “Let man learn to serve her!” Kraus says—and note this very carefully, it’s immensely important and we must clearly

---

172Kraus’s translations of Shakespeare appear under the following titles: Timon und Athen (1930), Shakespeares Sonette (1933), Shakespeares Dramen, 2 vols. (1934-35) (King Lear, The Taming of the Shrew, A Winter’s Tale, MacBeth, The Merry Wives of Windsor, Troilus and Cressida).


174For a discussion of Webern’s view of music history, see Wolfgang Rathert’s “Musikgeschichtliches Nomothetik: zum Formdenken Webers,” in Musiktheorie 6/3 (1991): 199-220. Rathert seeks to put Webern’s conception of musical and artistic aesthetics, as formulated in the Der Weg lectures, into a historical context in light of Adler’s teachings. He mentions Kraus only in passing and suggests that, despite Webern’s direct reference to Kraus, the composer’s conception of music as language should be viewed as evidence of a wider “Wiener Sprachphilosophie” and should also consider the influence of Ferdinand Ebner.
be agreed about it—that it would be foolish to set about dealing with this material, which we handle from our earliest years, as if the value involved were aesthetic. Not, then, because we want to be artistic snobs and dilettantes. What he says is that our concern with language and the secrets of language would be a moral gain. We must say the same! We are here to talk about music, not language, but it is all the same, and we can treat this as a starting point.\textsuperscript{175}

The Kraus essay to which Webern referred is “Die Sprache,” which appeared in \textit{Die Fackel} 885 in late December 1932. After paraphrasing some parts of the essay, as provided above, Webern then proceeded to quote a long passage from the middle of Kraus’s recent essay:

\begin{quote}
The practical application of the theory, which affects both language and speech, would never be that he who learns to speak should also learn the language, but that he should approach a grasp of the word shape, and with it the sphere whose riches lie beyond what is tangibly useful. This guarantee of a moral gain lies in a spiritual discipline which ensures the utmost responsibility toward the only thing there is no penalty for injuring—language—and which is more suited than anything else to teach respect for all the other values in life.\textsuperscript{176}
\end{quote}

Webern then skips several sentences and quotes three sentences from two separate places in the essay:

\begin{quote}
Nothing would be more foolish than to suppose that the need awakened or satisfied after perfection of language is an aesthetic one.\textsuperscript{177}

It is better to dream of plumbing the riddles behind her rules, the plans behind her pitfalls, than of commanding her. To teach people to see chasms in truisms—that would be the teacher’s duty toward a sinful generation.\textsuperscript{178}
\end{quote}

It is little wonder that Kraus’s essay appealed to Webern, for in it Kraus discussed not only the ethical dimension of language but also the natural laws by which language might

\textsuperscript{175}Path, 9; Weg, 9.\textsuperscript{.}

\textsuperscript{176}Path, 9-10; Weg, 9-10. Here Webern is quoting the last three lines of p. 1 and the first seven lines of p. 2 of Kraus’s essay; pp. 436-37 as it appears in Kraus, \textit{Werke}, vol. 2.

\textsuperscript{177}Path, 10; Weg, 10. This sentence is lines 29-31 of p. 2 of the essay; \textit{Werke}, vol. 2, 437.

\textsuperscript{178}Path, 10; Weg, 10. These sentences are lines 6-10 of p. 3 of the essay; \textit{Werke}, vol. 2, 438.
In Webern’s third lecture series, “Über musikalische Formen, Formenlehre an Hand vom Analysen” (Concerning Musical Form: the Teaching of Musical Form through Analysis), which is archived in the PSS but remains unpublished, he also pressed the analogy of music and language, further extolling the qualities of Faßlichkeit, Zusammenhang, and Gestalt, but without directly citing Kraus; see Moldenhauer, Chronicle, 419-421.

Interestingly, after opening both the first and second lectures of “The Path to the New Music” series with references to Kraus, Webern criticizes him for a satiric comment regarding music. The composer’s exasperation is reminiscent of his occasionally brusque reactions to Kraus in the pre-war years, and indeed it stems from a Krausian comment that must have stung the composer for more than twenty years:

But most recently—Karl Kraus! This is an interesting problem. I needn’t say what Karl Kraus means to me, how much I revere him—but here he is constantly making mistakes. Take his well-known aphorism about “music that washes against the shores of thinking.” This shows clearly that he is quite incapable of imagining that music can have an idea, a thought, hidden in it. . . . . It’s so absurd that Karl Kraus should have gone wrong in this way! What’s the reason? Some specific talent, which one must have got from somewhere, seems to be necessary if one is to grasp a musical idea.\(^{180}\)

\(^{179}\)In Webern’s third lecture series, “Über musikalische Formen, Formenlehre an Hand vom Analysen” (Concerning Musical Form: the Teaching of Musical Form through Analysis), which is archived in the PSS but remains unpublished, he also pressed the analogy of music and language, further extolling the qualities of Faßlichkeit, Zusammenhang, and Gestalt, but without directly citing Kraus; see Moldenhauer, Chronicle, 419-421.

\(^{180}\)Path, 14; Weg, 14-15. The aphorism that Webern paraphrases here first appeared in Kraus’s Sprüche und Wider sprüche (1909); Beim Wort genommen, 96. “Musik bespült die Gedankenküste. Nur wer kein Festland hat, wohnt in der Musik. Die leichteste Melodie weckt Gedanken wie die leichteste Frau. Wer sie nicht hat, sucht sie in der Musik und im Weibe. Die neue Musik ist ein Frauenzimmer, das seine natürlichen Mängel durch eine vollständige Beherrschung des Sanskrit ausgleicht.” This aphorism has been translated into English by Jonathan McVity in Dicta and Con dicta (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2001), 65. “Music cleanses the shores of thought. Only people with no mainland dwell in the world of music. The easiest melody awakens
Clearly, Webern had retained the critical distance that marked his earliest encounters with Kraus’s satire. Although Webern did not doubt Kraus’s intuitive “grasp of the form of the word” (Erfassung der Wortgestalt), Webern suspected that Kraus’s aphorism revealed that the satirist did not have the intuitive facility or gift necessary to discern those ideas that form the basis of music. After this critical aside, Webern returns to those tenets of Kraus’s theory that continued to be the most influential:

What is it, rather, that corresponds to the theory of language which Karl Kraus—rightly—so values? The laws of musical form-building! The second thing Karl Kraus starts from is the “moral gain.” When one gets an inkling of the laws, then one is bound to find one’s relationship to such minds entirely changed! One stops being able to imagine that a work can exist or alternatively needn’t—it had to exist. Where something special has been expressed, centuries always had to pass until people caught up with it. That’s the “moral gain.”

More than any particular technical aspect of Kraus’s literary technique, it was Kraus’s ideology of language and ethics that Webern had internalized, that became a component in the mature composer’s personal world view. For Webern, as for Kraus, the creation of artworks, be they works of literature or music, was imbued with an ethical imperative. Much as Kraus saw the corruption of the world in the misuse of language, Webern saw salvation in the creation of a moral and enduring musical work. This sentiment is clearly expressed in a letter to Berg in 1930:

Is not what we three, and naturally Kraus, are accomplishing the only reliable thing in this time? I believe that it is the only thing that will therefore endure, because we have a higher mission.182

thoughts, like the easiest woman. The man with no thoughts seeks them in music and womankind. The new music is a woman who compensates for her natural flaws by fully mastering Sanskrit.”

181 Path, 15; Weg, 15.

182 Letter from Webern to Berg, 3 May 1930. Quoted by Rode Alban Berg und Karl Kraus, 397. “Ist denn nicht das, was wir drei vollbringen und natürlich Kraus, das einzige Verläßliche in dieser Zeit? Ich glaube, das ist das einzige, was bleiben wird und demnach aber auch, da wir eine höhe Mission haben.” Webern’s letters to Jone from 27 September 1930 and 20 February 1934 also mention the importance of their role as artists; see Anton Webern: Briefe, 16-17, 20.
CHAPTER 3
WEBERN’S COMPOSITIONAL PROCESS

Anne Shreffler’s Lyric Impulse remains the most important source for information concerning Webern’s compositional process as revealed in the middle period song manuscripts. The following description briefly recounts much that is described in Shreffler’s work, in order to aid those readers who are less familiar with the composer’s creative method. This chapter also supplements Shreffler’s work by elaborating on select details of Webern’s compositional method that have not been mentioned in other monographs.

Paper Types/Use of Paper

Prior to the summer of 1925, when Webern began to sketch exclusively in hand-made sketchbooks, the composer jotted down his initial musical ideas in pencil on sheets of looseleaf staff paper.¹ He made these small, loose sheets by tearing upright (Hochformat) bifolios containing 12 to 48 staves into quadrants, some of which he then tore in half yet again, creating half- and quarter-sheets that range in size from 6 to 10 inches wide by 4 to 6 inches high or smaller.² These partial sheets were apparently torn by hand, more or less neatly, leaving two slightly ragged edges that give each sheet a unique appearance—a trait that has proven helpful in determining the chronology of the

¹Webern began to compose exclusively in bound sketchbooks in July 1925, beginning with the sketches of op. 18 no. 2. For brief discussions of this change in Webern’s compositional practice see Lynn, “Genesis, Process, and Reception,” 9; and Reinhardt, “From Poet’s Voice to Composer’s Muse,” 165.

²The sketchbooks were made from oblong format (Querformat) bifolios.
loose-leaf sketches.³ For his revision, fair, and printer’s copies the composer used large, intact bifolios with as many as 48 staves.⁴ Okabe Shin’ichiro’s survey of Webern’s sketches from between 1914 and 1925 strongly suggests that the composer tore the bifolios into partial sheets one at a time, as new sketch pages became necessary; i.e., he did not create and stockpile large quantities of the small sketching pages, a pattern of behavior consistent with his generally frugal use of paper. For this reason, related sketches often appear on the same paper type, although there are numerous exceptions, and fair copies are also occasionally on the same paper type as the related preliminary sketches. Webern sometimes used sketch pages again and again, sketching more than one piece on a single sheet. He also reused rejected pages of ink fair copies for sketching. In this study, specific issues of paper type will be discussed along with the general description of each manuscript in Chapters 4 and 5.

Like most other musicians in Vienna, Webern bought machine-made music paper from the same source, Josef Eberle & Company of Vienna, throughout his life. Many of the loose-leaf sketches and intact bifolios in the composer’s Nachlaß bear that manufacturer’s emblem, and a lesser number carry its watermark. Since the Josef Eberle & Company emblem was typically only imprinted in the lower half of one side of each folio, many of the half- and quarter-sheets bear no manufacturer’s insignia. In total, Okabe Shin’ichiro has determined that Webern’s Nachlaß includes 18 different types of music paper.⁵


⁴Shreffler wrote that Webern’s fair copies were written on “the sheets of 48 or 24 staves”; Lyric Impulse, 47. The revision score of “Wiese im Park,” however, comprises three 22-staff bifolios, and the printer’s copy comprises three 26-staff bifolios.

⁵“The Webern Sketches 1914 to 1925,” 122.
Types of Manuscripts

The catalog of the Paul Sacher Stiftung’s Webern Collection designates as *Skizzen* (sketches) all manuscripts which precede the *Reinshrift* (fair copy) stage of a work.\(^6\) This designation also includes, of course, all of the compositional materials for any work which was not completed and never reached the fair copy stage. The PSS catalog also uses the category *Entwurf* (draft) to refer to relatively lengthy sketches that are written in full score, but there are very few full-score sketches among Webern’s manuscripts of vocal music, and none of the Kraus settings falls into this category. Regarding Webern’s settings of Kraus’s poetry, the PSS category of *Skizzen* would include nearly all of the material available, except for the revision score, piano/vocal reductions, and printer’s copy (the latter not in the PSS) of the one published work, “Wiese im Park,” op. 13 no. 1. Such an encompassing categorization blurs distinct qualitative differences among the manuscripts, especially when one compares such fragmentary conceptions as “Mutig trägst du die Last,” M. 211, with the nearly complete settings of “Vallorbe,” M. 232, and “Vision des Erblindeten,” M. 236, all of which are designated as sketches in the PSS catalog. Anne Shreffler has suggested therefore a more detailed system of categorizing Webern’s loose-leaf manuscripts, and it is this classification system that will be used in the present study.

Pencil Sketches: Fragments and Continuity Drafts

In order to promote clarity and consistency among investigations of Webern’s compositional practices, this study of Webern’s Kraus settings has adopted the vocabulary employed by Shreffler in her pivotal work *Webern and the Lyric Impulse*.\(^7\) Shreffler referred to the loose-leaf sketches more precisely as “pencil sketches,” distinguishing these early versions of works from the more advanced ink drafts, many of

---

\(^6\)See Felix Meyer and Sabine Hänggi-Stampfli, eds., *Anton Webern Musikmanuskripte*.

\(^7\) *Lyric Impulse*, 42-44.
which also exhibit substantial revision. As the term implies, Webern’s pencil sketches uniformly feature a regular lead pencil as the only writing medium, and they are characterized by a great deal of revision. He wrote very small and often so lightly—particularly in the earliest stages—that complete erasure was easily possible and is, most likely, often undetectable. He deleted notes, figures, entire measures, or instrumental abbreviations either by striking out the material with a single stroke or by circling it. Circling the musical material had the advantage of keeping the figure in view and open to consideration, and occasionally figures that were circled and replaced in one manuscript will reappear in later versions of the same piece. If revisions of a given passage became overly crowded or cluttered, the composer would sometimes clarify by using letter notation (for instance, “gis” for pc G< ) or would label the final version “gilt” (valid). The very sharp pencil that the composer normally used resulted in notation that is quite clear and legible, despite the small size of the sketch pages, the typically diminuitive handwriting, the multiple layers of revision, and the subsequent crowding of the musical material.

The pencil sketches are nearly always in short score format with instrumental abbreviations, although there are a very few exceptions, such as the fragmentary setting of Kraus’s “In tiefster Schuld vor einem Augenpaar,” M. 210 (103-0760). In this nine-measure sketch fragment the three instruments (clarinet, violin, and harmonium) are labeled in the score’s left margin, and each instrument’s part is written on its own staff. The vocal lines in the pencil sketches are always written in the uppermost staff of each system, and the text of the vocal part might be written either above or below that staff, although above is the more common placement in the Kraus sketches. Much of the vocal text is missing from many of the song manuscripts, but the typically syllabic text setting makes it a small matter to recreate the intended declamation. In some instances, however—particularly in the briefest of the song fragments—the manuscript might include only one or two syllables of text, or the text might even be missing completely. In such cases it is often difficult or impossible to determine the intended text, and the layout of the staff systems might be the only clue that the piece is a song at all.
Shreffler further subdivided the category of “pencil sketches” into the two subcategories of “fragments” and “continuity drafts.” For Shreffler a sketch fragment is any manuscript material for a piece that was never completed. Works such as “Mutig trägst du die Last,” M. 211, which have multiple incomplete preliminary sketches, none of which proceeds for more than a few measures, will therefore be referred to as “fragments” and “fragmentary.” Like M. 211, many of the fragmentary song sketches are very brief, comprising nothing more than an instrumental introduction that ends shortly after the vocalist’s first entrance or phrase. Others, such as the fragmentary piano/voice version of “Wiese im Park,” continue for several pages, yet eventually peter out without completing the poem. Even the briefest of the sketch fragments might be very detailed and include dynamics, expressive markings, and detailed scoring, but this characteristic of Webern’s sketching process has occasionally been overstated. In general, the earliest measures of a fragment tend to be the most detailed, and the setting becomes less and less thorough as the sketch progresses. Some manuscripts contain very few expressive markings or indications of scoring even in the earliest measures, and a few contain long passages with no such details. The instrumentation is also the detail that seems to have been the most fluid and subject to frequent change.

Loosely adapting the terminology of Beethoven sketch studies, Shreffler has

---

8This definition differs from that of the PSS. In the PSS catalog a Fragment refers to a manuscript that is missing a page or is in some other way incompletely represented in the collection.

9In her description of Webern’s compositional process, Shreffler wrote, “Composition is fluent and seemingly rapid; all details of the piece, including instrumentation, dynamic and articulation marks, seem to have been conceived at once.” See Lyric Impulse, 50. While this description is certainly true of many sketches, Webern’s compositional approach—at least as evidenced by the Kraus manuscripts—is not as consistently thorough as this description suggests. As will be demonstrated in the discussion of some Kraus settings, in a few cases the composer seems to have been primarily concerned with pitch and rhythm during the initial stages of composition.

adapted the term “continuity draft” in the following manner:

In the Webernian continuity draft, the piece is written out from beginning to end in condensed score, with instrumentation, dynamics, and articulation marks at least partially designated. Although it represents by definition the last stage of sketching, it may also be the first stage of composition, and may bear signs of considerable reworking. The determining criterion here is that the sketch reaches what Webern considered to be the end of the piece.11

This definition works well with regard to Webern’s Kraus sketches, and three of the six sets of sketches on Kraus texts contain manuscripts which may be referred to as continuity drafts; these are “Wiese im Park,” M. 221 (op. 13 no. 1 after further revision), “Vallorbe,” M. 232, and “Vision des Erblindeten,” M. 236. It is important to emphasize that continuity drafts are essentially sketches, and that they are primarily distinguished by the fact that they continue until the end of the poem. The continuity drafts share every other characteristic with the fragmentary sketches and are not necessarily more complete with regard to scoring, expressive markings, or other musical details. Unlike Beethoven’s continuity drafts, which were invariably preceded by numerous preliminary sketches, Webern’s continuity drafts often are not compilations of previously composed passages. The continuity draft might, in fact, be the only extant version of a work, as is the case of “Vision des Erblindeten.” The continuity draft of this work is basically a lengthy sketch that achieved its more advanced status largely through the composer’s tenacity. The special status given to these manuscripts, however, is not inconsistent with the status that was provided them by the composer himself, as is evidenced by the fact that he invariably precisely dated (day/month/year) each continuity draft after the concluding double bar. The composer also maintained the date of the continuity draft as the date printed on his published works, even if the work was substantially revised later. As in the fragmentary sketches with which they are so closely related, there are many musical details that were not yet clearly defined in the continuity drafts. All three continuity drafts in this study become particularly sketchy near the end, providing only the barest outline of the final measures. Since it was Webern’s typical working procedure to create a fair copy of any

---

11Lyric Impulse, 43.
new continuity draft immediately, such incomplete drafts were perfectly adequate for his needs; obviously, Webern knew his own intentions. In the cases of continuity drafts for which fair copies were never created, however—as in the cases of “Vallorbe” and “Vision des Erblindeten”—the incomplete nature of these drafts can frustrate modern efforts at reconstruction and interpretation.

Fair Copies

Webern’s fair copies are full scores, carefully and spaciously notated in large, intact bifolios. The fair copies were notated primarily in ink, although colored pencils were used to bracket together the various instrumental groups, and red ink sometimes was used to write in the vocal text. The instrumental music in the fair copies was notated in the appropriate transpositions, and the instrumental staves were arranged in normal score order, much as they appear in the published score. The musical conception of the fair copies is very thorough, and all elements of scoring, dynamics, articulation, and musical expression, which may have been left inconclusive in the continuity drafts, are established. In fact, the fair copies often exhibit more detailed expressive markings than ultimately appeared in the published works. This is inevitably true of the very interesting Hauptstimme (primary voice) and Nebenstimme (secondary voice) symbols, which the composer painstakingly included in fair copies but which were never included in his published works.

Many of the fair copies also show evidence of additional, even extensive revisions. Again following Shreffler’s classification, the revised full scores will be referred to as “revision scores.” Those fair copies that were ultimately used as exemplars for publication, many of which also show evidence of revision, will be called “printer’s copies.”

Piano/Voice Reductions

Webern prepared piano/voice reductions of each orchestral and chamber song that he published through Universal Edition. In the case of “Wiese im Park,” the only Kraus
setting that reached this advanced stage, the piano/voice reduction is extant both in preparatory sketches and as a fair copy. Shreffler has pointed out that in some cases piano/voice reductions were created of orchestral songs that were later revised further, resulting in piano/voice versions that preserve alternative earlier versions of works.\textsuperscript{12} This is not the case with the “Wiese im Park” piano reductions, however.

**Dating of Manuscripts**

Webern was fairly meticulous in his habit of dating his compositional materials, and most of the manuscripts in this study bear dates in the composer’s handwriting. All of these autograph dates fall into one of the two categories that were described by Shreffler in her study of Webern’s Trakl settings,\textsuperscript{13} either they are exact dates that were written immediately upon completion of a new draft, or they are approximate dates that were added into the manuscripts at some later time. The exact dates are found only in the continuity drafts, in which he wrote the day, month, year and sometimes his place of residence after the double bar at the end of the draft. These dates are, of course, very helpful, but they can also be misleading, since Webern often maintained the date of the continuity draft on every subsequent copy and version of a piece, even if the work was substantially revised many years later. The date of the continuity draft is also, apparently, the only date that was given to Universal Edition. Therefore, even though “Wiese im Park” was revised as late as January 1925 and not published until 1926, the date provided in the published version is that of the continuity draft, 1917. Webern’s fixation on the earliest date suggests that he endowed the continuity draft with a special status, apparently considering the most vital stage of composition (as opposed to mechanical labor) to be complete at this point. In the case of “Wiese im Park” the revisions that took place years later were restricted to changes in scoring, dynamics, and expressive markings, not pitches or musical figures. It is also likely that Webern maintained the

\textsuperscript{12}Lyric Impulse, 44.

\textsuperscript{13}Lyric Impulse, 47-50.
earliest date for personal reasons, that he simply preferred to create the impression that these works were completed at the earliest date that he could justify. In the present study, this dating idiosyncracy is of little consequence, since “Wiese im Park” is the only Kraus setting that advanced beyond the continuity draft stage.

The second category of autograph dates usually provides only the year and sometimes the month or season at the top of a page. These approximate dates are usually found in the miscellaneous sketches and fragments and might also include a place name. For example, the continuity draft of “Vallorbe,” M. 232, is end-dated “5. VIII. 1918” (103-0776), whereas a sketch fragment on the same poem is dated “Mödling Sommer 1918” (103-0779). As opposed to the continuity drafts that were immediately end-dated, the sketch fragments were dated some time after composition. We know this because several of the dates are indecisive. For example, one of the fragmentary sketches of “Flüder,” M. 246, is dated “1920 o[der] 1921,” displaying an ambivalence that could have occurred only sometime after the time of composition. Furthermore, these retrospective dates are often in a writing medium different from that seen in the sketch itself, although that is not the case in any of the Kraus sketches. All of the approximate dates in the Kraus sketches are written in lead pencil, with no apparent difference in the writing medium, so it is possible that all of these materials, at least, were dated at approximately the same time. Shreffler has suggested that the approximate dates may have been added to the manuscripts at one of two points in the composer’s life, during which he was preoccupied with organizing his compositional materials: in the mid-1920s, when his music had first begun to be published by Universal Edition, or in the early 1930s, when he created a works list that includes his oeuvre up to op. 22.\footnote{Lyric Impulse, 49.}

**Instrumental Introductions to Songs**

Webern’s song manuscripts from between 1915 and 1924 provide ample evidence of a working procedure that was remarkably consistent. Although the musical
conceptions within these manuscripts are widely divergent, even between multiple settings of the same text, again and again the composer approached these texts in the same general manner. The pencil sketches invariably begin with instrumental introductions that range from a simple gesture for a single instrument to a densely polyphonic phrase for multiple instruments. There is no exception to this pattern in Webern’s Kraus sketches. As Shreffler has pointed out, the extremely chromatic introductory passages apparently were not designed for the practical purpose of providing the vocalist with a starting pitch. Rather, these introductions present basic musical ideas that are further developed in the following measures through transposition and transformation. Very often the rhythm, basic contour, intervallic profile, or pitch class set of one or more of these introductory gestures will be immediately reintroduced by the first vocal line. Other, later figures in the instruments and voice might, in turn, also be related to the introduction, although transformation of the motivic cell might make these relationships progressively more obscure. The relationship between the instrumental introduction and the music that follows will be provided in the discussion and analysis of each of the Kraus manuscripts in Chapters 4 and 5.

Many of the instrumental introductions in the Kraus sketches also present complete chromatic aggregates. These aggregates are usually somewhat repetitive—i.e., pitch classes will recur within the aggregate before the last pitch is provided—but the degree of pitch class repetition varies considerably. Webern experimented with a variety of methods for resolving these aggregates. Sometimes the last pitch class of the introductory aggregate will sound immediately before the entrance of the voice, resolving the chromatic phrase prior to the vocal entrance. In other cases the aggregate will be completed simultaneously with the first vocal pitch, or the first vocal pitch might itself complete the aggregate, thereby eliding the introduction with the first vocal phrase. Interestingly, it is common for the introductory aggregate formation to be the only obviously intentional linking of aggregate formations to phrase structure within the
sketch. As will be shown in a few sketches, however, particularly the continuity draft of “Vallorbe,” M. 232, the formation of aggregates sometimes constituted an important compositional strategy throughout a work.

**Priority of the Vocal Setting**

After the instrumental introduction the composer inevitably turned his attention to composing the vocal line. Again and again, Webern’s song manuscripts reveal that he composed in a very linear and layered manner, beginning with the vocal line. He would usually create a vocal setting of the text for several measures, nearly always continuing until a major structural division of the poem, and then go back and compose the instrumental parts up to that point. We know this because of the numerous fragmentary sketches in which the vocal line continued considerably longer than the other parts before the setting was abandoned altogether. One example of this compositional pattern is provided by Example 3.1 (“Flieder,” M. 246, 103-0791), in which the vocal line is set

Example 3.1: “Flieder,” M. 246, PSS 103-0791, systems 2 and 3
Example 3.2: “Flieder,” M. 246, PSS 103-0793, example of linear composition
aggregate is completed by the d\textsuperscript{2}-c\textsubscript{1} in the clarinet (m. 2 staff 2) that is roughly parallel with the end of the first vocal phrase. Among the numerous motivic relationships that link the instrumental introduction to the music that follows is the clearly audible ascending perfect fourth that begins both the opening bass clarinet gesture in m. 1 (F-B=) and the first vocal figure (c\textsuperscript{2}-f\textsuperscript{2}). The music then continues in a fairly detailed setting through the end of the first poetic line, followed by the brief instrumental interlude in m. 4. At that point the instruments drop out altogether, but the vocal setting continues for six more measures, providing a vocal line sufficient to set the entire first stanza of the poem.

Some of the fragmentary sketches suggest that Webern's linear approach to composition extended beyond the creation of the vocal line. In some manuscripts Webern first composed the vocal line, then moved to another instrument or staff line and worked in that part toward the end of the phrase, before moving to yet another element of the texture. Shreffler has compared this manner of composition to the contrapuntal processes of a medieval motet and on this basis has questioned the extent to which the composer sought to control the vertical sonorities.\textsuperscript{16} This is a very interesting question that deserves more attention, yet it is important not to over-generalize Webern's compositional process. When Webern worked in a linear fashion the previously-composed figures were not necessarily “fixed,” and there is ample evidence that the composer would manipulate the vocal line and other figures for a variety of musical purposes.

***Multiple Settings of the Same Text***

The two “Flieder” fragments discussed above, two of the four musically distinct “Flieder” settings that Webern created, also provide excellent examples of one of Webern’s most intriguing compositional traits: the tendency to set the same texts over and over again in numerous, musically diverse versions. As Shreffler has rightly pointed

\textsuperscript{16}Lyric Impulse, 53 and n. 37.
out, Webern explored various possibilities for a text as an integral part of his compositional process, often generating numerous fragmentary settings that proceed for no more than a few measures. There are a few instances among the Kraus sketches in which an earlier fragment is obviously related musically to a later setting, but often two or more fragmentary settings of the same text will share nothing more than the text itself and perhaps its general declamation, although the latter was subject to significant change as well. In other cases there are subtle similarities, such as the retention of certain pitches, pitch classes, or pc sets from version to version, or perhaps a common compositional approach, such as the use of chromatic aggregates to delineate musical phrases.

The practice of setting and resetting the same texts seems indicative of the essentially experimental nature of Webern’s composition during the decade between 1914 and 1924. This repetitious technique may have helped the composer find solutions to compositional problems that he then transferred into other pieces. What seems obvious is that he could only proceed successfully with a setting once he was satisfied with the opening measures. Often, if he could get passed that point, the rest of the setting would go rather rapidly. There are instances, however, such as the early piano/voice version of “Wiese im Park,” when he would get through a significant portion of the poem and yet still abandon the effort. Webern typically encountered the most difficulty at major transitions, particularly at the ends of poetic stanzas or at abrupt juxtapositions of poetic imagery. He also obsessively revised the endings of works and frequently rewrote the last measures in much the same manner that he sketched and re-sketched the first.

---

17 *Lyric Impulse*, 59. Shreffler’s interesting discussion of Webern’s propensity for creating multiple fragmentary settings is on pp. 58-63. On p. 61 Shreffler supplies a table that lists nineteen texts that Webern set in multiple, musically distinct versions between 1913 and 1924, including four Kraus poems: “Wiese im Park,” “Flieder,” “In tiefster Schuld,” and “Mutig trägst du die Last.”

18 This four-page fragmentary sketch of “Wiese im Park” (PSS 101-0503 through 101-0506) constitutes 33 measures and provides a setting of eight of the poem’s twelve lines.
Notational Idiosyncracies

Multiple Layers of Sketching and Erasure

As has already been pointed out, Webern was very frugal with his music paper, sketching on both sides of the half- and quarter-sheets and crowding them with musical details. The composer wrote in, underneath, and above staves, as well as in the margins, sometimes using arrows to show where “misplaced” figures should be reinserted. He also used symbols to indicate where isolated, revised figures or passages should be inserted on other sketch pages. All of these compositional habits were carried over into the sketchbooks and have been described by other musicologists, yet one aspect of Webern’s sketches—at least as it is evidenced in his Kraus manuscripts—has never been emphasized or even briefly mentioned: the role that erasure played in Webern’s compositional process.

While discussing the early atonal period during one of his 1932 Path to the New Music lectures, Webern quoted Schoenberg as saying “The most important thing in composing is an eraser!” Webern then went on to describe composition during the period as a “matter of constant testing.”

Webern frequently sketched extremely lightly, even in the earliest measures of a sketch, exploring various possibilities. He would then erase these earlier figures and sketch over the same area again. Once he became satisfied with a particular figure or passage, he would sometimes trace over the figure, darkening it and making it more permanent. This type of sketching and erasure is very difficult to detect, for the earliest layers were so lightly notated that the erasure could be complete without marring the paper. The best evidence of this pattern of lightly sketching, erasing, sketching, and erasing is found in those instances when he sketched not only in the “working” system, but in another system on the page. Example 3.3, a diplomatic transcription of the fourth and final page of the “Vision des Erblindeten” continuity draft primarily working in the upper system of five staves, but preliminary sketches were

---

19The Path to the New Music, 51; Der Weg zur Neuen Musik, 55. “Schoenberg sagte, ‘Das Wichtigste beim Komponieren ist der Radiergummi.’ Es gilt immer nachzuprüfen.”
Example 3.3: “Vision des Erblindeten,” M. 236, PSS 103-0781, diplomatic transcription of the final page

written in the lower system of four staves. The figures in the lower system are much more tentative and lightly sketched than those of the final layer in the upper system. The relationship between the chords in the upper system and those directly below is obvious, although many of the pitches are displaced by an octave, and the appearance of the word “Gottes” in the lower system clearly establishes the relationship. The example provided here is particularly clear, and many other, similar examples exist in the fragmentary settings of Kraus’s poems. In many instances, the fact that Webern abandoned a sketch
fragment at an early stage is the only reason that such evidence survives. In the final page of the “Vision des Erblindeten” draft, the setting was completed in the page’s first system. There was no reason, therefore, for the composer to erase the preliminary sketches in the lower system, especially since this particular continuity draft appears to have been abandoned immediately; no fair copy was ever made. In this regard, the abandoned, fragmentary sketches provide the clearest evidence of a layered compositional method that by its very nature often obliterated its own origins. While it is not necessarily incorrect to describe Webern’s compositional process during the middle period as “quick” and “fluent,” as Shreffler and others have done, his creative process could be rather arduous and convoluted. Study of the Kraus manuscripts clearly reveals that Webern painstakingly fashioned these songs through a multi-layered, protracted process of lightly sketching within measures and beneath them, erasing, re-sketching, and so forth, ultimately leaving manuscripts that reveal only a portion of the compositional process.

**Ambiguous and Missing Accidentals**

Although Webern’s notation is usually very clear and precise, in the smallest, lightest, and most heavily revised sketches it can be difficult to determine the difference between some accidentals, particularly the sharp and natural. He sometimes formed a sharp in a single up-and-down/criss-crossing motion without lifting the pencil from the page, and the resulting accidental can be indistinct. The problem of indistinct accidentals is compounded in those numerous instances when the composer changed the accidental on a note by erasing and replacing it or, worse yet, by simply overwriting the original. Even more problematic is the fact that Webern frequently neglected to write in accidentals altogether. This is, for obvious reasons, a much greater problem when dealing with sketches of atonal music than when dealing with functionally tonal or even more-or-less strictly serial compositions. The interpretive problems are further exacerbated when dealing with sketches that contain unique conceptions of a work and for which no other manuscripts can be consulted. A comparison of those Kraus settings
that do exist in multiple, musically related versions, at least one of which has missing accidentals, indicates that in most cases notes with missing accidentals were intended to be natural. Leaving accidentals off of natural pitches is consistent, of course, with the common notational practices of functionally tonal music, so this is the “error” that we would most readily expect for Webern to have made. Also in keeping with common notational practices, the composer often left out accidentals when a pitch is repeated within the same measure. In most instances the absence again seems to indicate that the second note has the same accidental as its predecessor, as is demonstrated by the repeated chords in staff 3 of Example 3.3. The composer also occasionally left out accidentals when a pitch was repeated either immediately or in very close proximity, even if the recurrence was after a barline. This type of missing accidental can be seen in staff 3 of Example 3.3 between the tetrachords on the downbeats of mm. 31 and 32, and also on beat 2 of m. 32 moving to the downbeat of m. 33. Several more such instances will be highlighted in the discussion of the sketch fragments on the poem “In tiefster Schuld,” the setting of which is characterized by the immediate repetition of pitches within the vocal line.

One characteristic of Webern’s notation that can often help in interpreting missing accidentals is that he generally avoided the use of unusual spellings of those pitches separated by the natural halfstep; i.e., Webern rarely notated E♭ = B♭ or C♯. In fact, in the Kraus settings Webern never used these atypical enharmonic spellings unless there was a clear reason for doing so. If an accidental is missing on the one of those pitches, one may usually assume that the pitch is natural, and if the accidental is ambiguous, then the choices are also narrowed. Example 3.4 provides a partial transcription of 103-0776, the final page of the “Vallorbe” continuity draft. Several examples of missing accidentals appear in these measures, including those missing in staves 2 and 3 on the trichord of m. 53 beat 2. In that measure the missing accidentals suggest that the g♭-e♭-a♭ trichord in beat 1 is immediately repeated. Even more interesting are the unusual

---

20 Staff 1 of this example is the vocal line. The eighth notes f<1-f<1-e<1-a1 are part of an earlier, lightly notated layer.
Example 3.4: “Vallorbe,” M. 232, PSS 103-0776, mm. 51-55, atypical chromatic spellings

enharmonic spellings that Webern used in m. 51 staff 1. While the accidental on the e<\textsuperscript{1} in this measure is precisely notated, the notehead itself is not, and the pitch might actually be f<\textsuperscript{1}. If that is true, then the second f\textsuperscript{4} eighth note would be f>\textsuperscript{1}. It is more likely, however, since Webern did not place an accidental on the second f\textsuperscript{4}, that this note is actually a repeat of the f<\textsuperscript{1} immediately previous, and that he then used the e<\textsuperscript{1} to notate the chromatically adjacent pitch. The composer notated the c=\textsuperscript{2} sixteenth note for essentially the same reason, and there he thought it necessary to clarify with letter notation above the staff. These examples represent the type of crowded and chromatic situations in which the composer would use an atypical enharmonic spelling.

Rhythmic Ambiguities

The composer occasionally left off the flags and beams of notes while sketching, often writing eighth notes that appear as quarters or sixteenths that appear as eighths. An example of this appears in m. 53 staff 2 of Example 3.4. Occasionally these ambiguous rhythms seemed to have resulted from revision of the original rhythm, but in other instances there is no apparent reason for the anomaly. As Example 3.4 demonstrates, the solutions to these rhythmic ambiguities are usually fairly obvious, when the relative spatial arrangement of the various figures is taken into account.
Missing and Ambiguous Clefs

Webern also occasionally left out clefs, or—even more problematic—including a clef in a staff and then wrote music that was not intended for that clef. Several examples of missing and erroneous clefs are provided by Example 3.5, a transcription of the first staff system of 103-0791, one of the four fragmentary settings of Kraus’s “Flieder.” In the first system of this sketch page Webern drew a treble clef at the beginning of staff 3, but the harp tetrachord in m. 5 is apparently intended to be a bass clef figure. In this instance, the unlikelihood that the composer would have notated c<sup>2</sup> and e<sup>2</sup> clearly indicates a clef error, and the treble clef he inserted in m. 6 verifies this reading. The composer drew a bass clef at the beginning of staff 4, yet the violin part that begins in m. 5 must have been intended as a treble clef figure—an interpretation that is predicated both on the < in the staff’s third space and the lowest note (g) of the instrument. The sixth staff of the first system is missing a clef altogether. In this case the similarity of the motive in m. 2 staff 2 to that of m. 5 staff 6, combined once again with the unlikelihood that the composer would have notated e<sup>3</sup>, indicates that the figures in staff 6 should be read in treble clef. The scoring for flute and trumpet in the following measure is consistent with this reading. The most unusual clef problems are those instances when a single measure within a single staff contains both bass clef and treble clef figures. An example of this idiosyncracy appears in the second system of 103-0791, a transcription of which was previously provided as Example 3.1.<sup>21</sup> In m. 9 staves 2-4 the beaming of the eighth-note figures indicates that m. 3 staff 3 must be read in both treble and bass clef. Other similar instances occur in the Kraus sketches, although they are rarely beamed between staves in the revealing manner shown in Example 3.1. In some instances a single measure and staff will simply contain multiple musical figures, one or more of which would exceed the designated instrument’s range if read in a single clef, but there might be other similar notational ambiguities that completely escape detection.

---

<sup>21</sup> Measures 10-11 of this sketch page also provide another example of Webern sketching beneath the working system. Once again, if the sketch had proceeded further, these preliminary sketches would have been erased.
Example 3.5: “Flieder,” M. 246, PSS 103-0791, continuity draft, page 1, system 1

Missing Rests

While sketching, Webern typically did not bother to fill empty or partially empty measures with rests, if the omitted rests were not necessary for interpreting the musical figures. Several examples of missing rests appear in Example 3.1, including m. 7 staff 4 and m. 8-9 staff 2. When dealing with the most fragmentary of sketches, especially in the later measures, the omission of these rests can sometimes make it difficult to determine if a given measure was finished or remained incomplete. Interpretive problems of this sort begin in m. 11 of Example 3.1. Conversely, when the composer did write in “unnecessary” rests, those rests can signal that the music in a measure was completed, even though it might otherwise seem not to be. An example of the latter case will be discussed in connection to a fragmentary setting of Kraus’s “In tiefster Schuld” (103-0763), in which the notated rests clearly indicate that the unusually sparse texture of some measures was the composer’s intention. The issue of rests will also be discussed in relation to the “Vallorbe” continuity draft, where the rests that the composer wrote in, many of which are not necessary to the interpretation of the notated figures, provide clues...
to an underlying compositional strategy by delineating the aggregates that underlie the small-scale phrase structures.

Locations and Types of Manuscripts for Webern’s Kraus Settings

Nearly all of the compositional materials for Webern’s settings of Kraus’s poetry are located in the Webern Collection of the Paul Sacher Stiftung in Basel, Switzerland. The only exception is an autograph printer’s copy of the *Four Songs*, op. 13, which contains a version of “Wiese im Park” that is identical to the version published by Universal Edition in 1926. This printer’s copy, like nearly all of the other extant printer’s copies, was once in the possession of Universal Edition and is now located in the Lehman Collection of the Pierpont Morgan Library in New York. Webern’s Kraus settings contain manuscripts representing every stage of his compositional process, from the earliest sketches and continuity drafts (usually loose leaves) to fair and printer’s copies (bifolios), although each of these compositional stages is not extant for every work. Unlike the materials found in Webern’s six sketchbooks, which wholly contain and meticulously document every stage of the compositional process of the twelve-tone works, the loose leaf sketches were particularly vulnerable to loss and damage. The condition of these manuscript pages varies widely from some that are well preserved to a few that are severely damaged. While some of the individual pages among the Kraus sketches have suffered some damage and a general deterioration of the poor quality paper, fortunately all of them are still legible. The condition of each manuscript will be detailed in the discussions of the works in Chapters 4 and 5.
Table 3.1: Autograph Manuscript Sources for Webern’s Settings of Kraus Texts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>“Wiese im Park,” op. 13 no. 1</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ms. Type</strong></td>
<td><strong>Pp./mm.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Instruments</strong></td>
<td><strong>Date</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. sk (frag)</td>
<td>1 p./6 mm.</td>
<td>fl, cl, b cl, tpt, tbn, vn, va, 2 vc, db, cel, hp</td>
<td>Leoben, 1916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. sk (frag)</td>
<td>4 pp./43 mm.</td>
<td>voice &amp; piano</td>
<td>Leoben, 1916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. sk (cd)</td>
<td>6 pp./57 mm.</td>
<td>fl, E= cl, cl, b cl, tpt, D tpt, tbn, hn, vn, va, vc, db, cel, glock, hp</td>
<td>Sommer 1917 [&amp;] 16. VI. 1917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. revision score</td>
<td>12 pp./51 mm.</td>
<td>fl, cl, b cl, tpt, tbn, hn, vn, va, 2 vc, 2 db, cel, glock, hp</td>
<td>*1917 Klagenfurt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. sk (cd)</td>
<td>4 pp./51 mm.</td>
<td>voice/piano reduction</td>
<td>**February 1924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. fair copy</td>
<td>5 pp./51 mm.</td>
<td>voice/piano reduction</td>
<td>[before February 1925]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. printer’s copy</td>
<td>12 pp./51 mm.</td>
<td>fl, cl, b cl, tpt, tbn, hn, vn, va, vc, db, cel, glock, hp (as published)</td>
<td>[before February 1925]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>“Vallorbe,” M. 232</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ms. Type</strong></td>
<td><strong>Pp./mm.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Instruments</strong></td>
<td><strong>Date</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. sk (frag)</td>
<td>1 p./7 mm.</td>
<td>ob, cl, b cl, 3 tpt, vc, hp</td>
<td>[after June 1917]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. sk (frag)</td>
<td>1 p./22 mm.</td>
<td>fl, cl, b cl, tpt, vn, va, vc, db, glock, hp</td>
<td>Mödling, Sommer 1918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. sk (cd)</td>
<td>4 pp./69 mm.</td>
<td>cl, b cl, tpt, hn, tbn, vn, va, vc, db, cel, glock, hp, timp</td>
<td>6. VIII 1918</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>“Vision des Erblindeten,” M. 236</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ms. Type</strong></td>
<td><strong>Pp./mm.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Instruments</strong></td>
<td><strong>Date</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. sk (cd)</td>
<td>5 pp./47 mm.</td>
<td>fl, cl, b cl, tpt, hn, tbn, vn, va, vc, db, cel, hp, b dr</td>
<td>2. VII 1919 [Mürzzuschlag]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.1: Continued

**“In tiefster Schuld,” M. 210**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ms. Type</th>
<th>Pp./mm.</th>
<th>Instruments</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. sk (frag)</td>
<td>1 p./13 mm.</td>
<td>voice &amp; piano</td>
<td>1920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. sk (frag)</td>
<td>1 p./9 mm.</td>
<td>cl, vn, harm</td>
<td>[1920]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**“Flieder,” M. 246**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ms. Type</th>
<th>Pp./mm.</th>
<th>Instruments</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. sk (frag)</td>
<td>1 p./13 mm.</td>
<td>voice &amp; piano</td>
<td>[1920]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. sk (frag)</td>
<td>1 p./15 mm.</td>
<td>fl, cl, tpt, hn, tbn, vn, vc, hp, glock</td>
<td>1920 Mödl.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. sk (frag)</td>
<td>1 p./10 mm.</td>
<td>cl, b cl, hn, tbn, vn, va, vc, cel, hp</td>
<td>1920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. sk (frag)</td>
<td>1 p./12 mm.</td>
<td>fl, cl, E= cl, tpt, tbn, vn, va, vc, cel, glock, hp, b dr</td>
<td>1920 o[der] 21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**“Mutig trägst du die Last,” M. 211**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ms. Type</th>
<th>Pp./mm.</th>
<th>Instruments</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. sk (frag)</td>
<td>1 p./10 mm.</td>
<td>ob, vn, vc, harm, [others]</td>
<td>[1924]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. sk (frag)</td>
<td>1 p./6 mm.</td>
<td>voice &amp; piano</td>
<td>[1924]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. sk (frag)</td>
<td>1 p./6 mm.</td>
<td>cl, hn, vn, vc</td>
<td>[1924]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes to Table 3.1**

*This approximate date is not found on the actual manuscripts of the op. 13 no. 1 revision score but on several title pages that accompany these manuscripts in the folder at the PSS. The date was probably written on these title pages at some later time.

**This date does not appear on the manuscripts of the op. 13 no. 1 piano reduction sketches but on the informal title page in which the sketches for the voice/piano reductions of all four songs are found. The dated inscription is in Webern’s hand and reads as follows: Skizzen / Klavierauszuge / der / 4 Orchesterlieder op 13 / (Februar 1924)*
CHAPTER 4

WEBERN’S INCOMPLETE KRAUS SETTINGS

“Vallorbe,” M. 232

Context

One year after creating the continuity draft of “Wiese im Park” (end-dated 16 June 1917) Webern began working with Kraus’s “Vallorbe,” the three settings of which are collectively cataloged as M. 232 and were included by Moldenhauer as the first of a group of three unpublished Kraus songs. With twelve lines of twelve syllables per line, “Vallorbe” is the longest Kraus poem that Webern set. Unlike “Wiese im Park,” which he set in widely disparate versions for various ensembles, all three versions of “Vallorbe” are orchestral songs and are at least loosely related musically. The compositional history of the song is preserved in six manuscript pages that comprise two one-page, fragmentary sketches and a four-page continuity draft, the latter of which sets the entire poem. These manuscripts originated in the Viennese suburb of Mödling, where Webern moved in early June 1918. The earliest of these manuscripts, 101-0582, was not dated by the composer, but it undoubtedly was created after he had given up his job at Prague’s Deutsches Landestheater, where he had been engaged as an opera coach and occasional conductor since August of the previous year. The poem was first published in the November 1917

---


2Chronicle, 222.
issue of *Die Fackel*, and according to Moldenhauer, the busy theater season continued through May and allowed Webern little time for creative work. The latter two “Vallorbe” settings were dated by the composer; sketch fragment 103-0779 bears the inscription “Mödling, Sommer 1918,” and the continuity draft (103-0775 through 103-0778) is end-dated 5 August 1918.

Webern’s move to Mödling, which afforded him close proximity to Schoenberg, provided him an ideal creative environment, and he soon generated a number of pieces, nearly all orchestral songs. In addition to the three “Vallorbe” manuscripts, Webern also created fragmentary sketches on texts by Trakl (“Die Sonne,” “Gesang einer gefangenen Amsel,” and “Klage”) and Goethe (“Cirrus,” M. 235), and he achieved a continuity draft on Bethge’s translation of Tschuan Jo Su’s “Nächtliches Bild,” M. 233. All of these projects, however, remained unfinished at that time. The only new work to be completed—i.e., to reach the fair copy stage—during the summer and fall of 1918 was a setting of Trakl’s “Ein Winterabend,” which eventually became the last of the *Four

---

3 The poem appears on the last page (p. 32) of *Die Fackel* 472-73 (November 1917). This volume of *Die Fackel* was devoted entirely to Kraus’s epigrams and poetry. Webern’s handwritten library catalog lists a complete series of *Die Fackel* for this year, so the journal was likely the composer’s source for the text. “Vallorbe” was later included in volume 3 of *Worte in Versen* (1918).


5 Shreffler’s comprehensive chronological list of “Webern’s Compositions and Fragments 1915-1921,” included as Appendix 2 of her dissertation (pp. 331-37), lists 14 fragmentary song sketches in the year 1918, in addition to the continuity drafts of “Vallorbe,” “Ein Winterabend,” and “Nächtliches Bild.” Only two of these fragments, one an alternate setting of Goethe’s “Cirrus” and the other a setting of an unidentified poem, are for voice and piano; all others designate several other instruments. Shreffler’s list also includes a fragmentary sketch for a string quartet, dated 5 July 1918, and an arrangement of Webern’s *Passacaglia for Orchestra*, op. 1, for two pianos, six hands.

6 The settings of Trakl’s “Gesang einer gefangenen Amsel,” op. 14 no. 6, and “Die Sonne,” op. 14 no. 1, were not completed until 1919 and 1921, respectively. “Klage” remained incomplete; this 10-measure sketch is unique, and the manuscript has no catalog number.
Songs, op. 13. Shreffler has suggested that Webern’s quarrel with and temporary break from Schoenberg during the early fall may have interfered with Webern’s “creative energies,” and certainly after this break the younger composer spent considerable time and energy looking for employment and considering another move away from Mödling. By the time that Webern and Schoenberg were reconciled in early November, the two were busy preparing for the inaugural season of Schoenberg’s Society for Private Musical Performances, the commencement of which effectively stifled Webern’s compositional activities until the following summer. Personal unrest was surely a factor in Webern’s failure to finish some of the projects that he began in the fall of 1918, but his difficulties with Schoenberg did not begin until September, and he had abandoned the “Vallorbe” project well before that time. Following his typical working procedure, we would expect Webern to have created a fair copy of the work soon after completing the continuity draft, but he apparently did not. In a letter to Berg dated 8 August 1918, just three days after completing the continuity draft of “Vallorbe,” Webern wrote that he has been busy composing, but “So far not very luckily.” He went on to say that he was optimistic that things would soon be different. The timing of Webern’s comment suggests that he abandoned his setting of “Vallorbe” because he was not pleased with the musical result.

Sequence of Sketches

The manuscript microfilmed as 101-0582 is clearly the earliest of Webern’s three settings of “Vallorbe,” for the sketch bears only slight musical similarities with the latter two settings, and there is a strong antecedent-consequent relationship between the second

---

7. Webern did not include “Ein Winterabend” among the songs of op. 13 until sometime after 1921.

8. Lyric Impulse, 68.


Example 4.1: “Vallorbe,” M. 232, comparison of vocal lines

Vallorbe,” M. 232, comparison of vocal lines (103-0779) and the continuity draft (103-0775 through 103-0778). Example 4.1 provides a transcription of the entire vocal line from 101-0582 and six measures of the vocal lines from 103-0779 and 103-0775, the latter constituting the first page of the continuity draft. The fragmentary sketch 103-0779 is readily identifiable as an intermediate stage between 101-0582 and the continuity draft of “Vallorbe,” for many of the revisions that appear in the upper layers of 103-0779 also appear in the primary layer of the latter manuscript, whereas 101-0582 is the most dissimilar of the three. As can be seen in the example, the vocal line of 101-0582 shares only two notes, d\textsuperscript{2} on “himm[isches]” and c\textsuperscript{1} on “[Ge]flecht,” with the later manuscripts, but it has a very similar contour and rhythm. In m. 3 of 103-0779 the two eighth notes at the end of the measure were originally d\textsuperscript{1} and a\textsuperscript{1} (depicted in Example 4.1 with non-standard note heads), but Webern then circled these and replaced them with a second b\textsuperscript{1} and an e\textsuperscript{1}. This revision is reflected in the first page of the continuity draft. In m. 5 of 103-0779 the composer rewrote the vocal line beneath the staff, and this revision is also reflected in 103-0775. As the vocal lines of 103-0779 and 103-0775 continue, significant differences accumulate, as will be further discussed below, but the sequence of the three “Vallorbe” manuscripts is clear.
PSS 101-0582

“Vallorbe” manuscript 101-0582 is a single-page, fragmentary, pencil sketch, comprising seven measures of music for soprano voice, clarinet, bass clarinet, three trumpets, cello, and harp. The sketch was written on a 16-staff, vertical format, partial sheet, torn from its bifolio on the right side and into a partial sheet along the bottom. When this fragmentary setting of “Vallorbe” is right-side-up, the paper manufacturer’s stamp appears upside-down in the upper right margin: J. E. & Co., No. 7, 22-staff. At some point someone other than the composer wrote “Kraus” on the right side of the upper margin. The setting is written in condensed-score format on two systems of five and four staves, respectively.Abbreviated instrumental markings indicate the instrumentation of nearly every figure, although the scoring of the later measures becomes less clear. The verso of 101-0582 (101-0581) contains the first two measures of an ink fair copy of “Abendland III,” op. 14 no. 4. Webern’s Nachlaß contains several abandoned fair copies that he later reused for sketching. The composer apparently abandoned the ink score of “Abendland III” after incorrectly notating the rhythm of the vocal line. According to Shreffler, the three-page continuity draft of “Abendland III” is dated 23 June 1917. Following his typical working method, Webern must have created the abortive fair copy on manuscript 101-0581 soon thereafter.

A transcription of 101-0582 is provided in its entirety as Example 4.2. The

---

11. The second system is joined together only by a vertical line at the extreme left side; there are no other barlines. These four staves are completely blank except for a treble clef and a single pitch in the uppermost (vocal) staff in m. 7.

12. Lyric Impulse, 66.

13. This transcription does not preserve the spatial arrangement of the original, for, contrary to many of Webern’s more heavily revised sketches, this sketch is very legible and easily interpreted. The only problematic notation is on the downbeat of m. 6, the lower two notes of the a-c<1-f<1 trichord in the third staff. These two notes are very small, relatively indistinct, and have no stem; i.e., they are not stemmed together with one another or with the f<1. Webern may have first written the a and c<1 in m. 6, where they are in ic 1 relationships with the A= and c of the bass, and then moved them into the trichord of m. 5, beat 2, one octave higher, as also shown in the Example 4.2. It is
It is therefore obvious that the manuscript was difficult to identify at first, given the near absence of text and the manuscript’s subtle relationship with the subsequent settings. The earliest setting of “Vallorbe” is adequate to set only the first eight syllables of the poem (“Du himmlisches Geflecht, du Glockenblumenkorb”), just over half of the first line, but only the first word is written in the manuscript.  

unlikely that the dyad should appear in both places, one immediately following the other, and the notes are written much more clearly in m. 5.

Example 4.2: “Vallorbe,” M. 232, PSS 101-0582, transcription

Webern’s song sketches
usually end at a major division in the poem, and it is thus somewhat unusual, though not unique, that this sketch ends abruptly after one syllable of a multi-syllabic word, as if the composer was interrupted. Perhaps it was the large number of syllables and vivid imagery of the word “Glockenblumenkorb” that gave Webern pause. His repeated efforts to set this word in 103-0779 ultimately rendered the measure nearly indecipherable.

Despite its brevity, 101-0582 looks like the beginning of an ambitious attempt to create a monumental setting of Kraus’s poem. The first measure calls for three trumpets, suggesting that the accompanying orchestra necessary to balance the trumpet section was to be large. Webern also set the text very spaciously, as can be seen in mm. 3-4, where “himm[lisches]” is held for two and one half beats, and in mm. 5-6, where the poem’s first comma (in the middle of the first line) is observed with a corresponding two and one half beats of rest. The comparison of the “Vallorbe” vocal lines in Example 4.1 shows that the subsequent versions became more concise. Shreffler has argued that Webern’s works and fragments of 1915-1917 document the composer’s self-conscious attempt to compose on a much larger time-scale than before, and the settings of “Vallorbe” show this tendency continuing in 1918. Shreffler accomplished her comparison by counting the beats of completed works or, for the fragments, by counting the beats and extrapolating the required length of a complete setting. If Webern had set all three stanzas of “Vallorbe” according to the dimensions established in these first seven measures (half of the first line, or 6 syllables, in 6 beats, not counting the three-beat introduction nor the music of mm. 6-7), the piece would have been well over 140 beats long, rivaling the 149 beats that Shreffler projected as necessary to complete the 1916 sketch fragment of “Wiese im Park,” by far the longest of the potential pieces in her comparison. Of course, the 101-0582 version of “Vallorbe” sets only a very small portion of the text (just over 5 percent), making such comparisons highly speculative at best. It is obvious, however,

The difficulty of identification is probably what led someone to write “Kraus” at the top of the manuscript.

15*Lyric Impulse*, 88-90.
that Webern continued to strive for longer compositions in 1918 and that he turned to a Kraus text for inspiration.\footnote{Meter and tempo changes could have shortened the potential length of the work, if it had been completed, and subsequent revisions also may have condensed it dramatically. The latter was certainly the case with “Wiese im Park,” the continuity draft (1917) of which, at 102 beats, is 30 percent shorter than the potential length of the longest sketch fragment (1916).}

Sketch fragment 101-0582 begins with two measures of instrumental introduction that feature an oboe solo above a sustained trichord in the trumpet trio and an ostinato harp figure in the bass. As is typical of Webern’s harmonic language, ic 1 relationships are pervasive, heard in the oboe’s b\textsuperscript{1}-c\textsuperscript{2}-b\textsuperscript{1} triplet, in the major sevenths between the oboe’s g<\textsuperscript{2} and the second trumpet’s a\textsuperscript{1} and between the f\textsuperscript{4} and f< of the harp ostinato, as well as in the minor ninth between the e=\textsuperscript{2} and d\textsuperscript{1} of the first and third trumpets. Nearly everything that follows in subsequent measures can be related to the initial three motives of the harp, trumpets, and oboe. The last and lowest instrumental voice to sound in the introduction, the bass clarinet entering in m. 2, presents a 3-5 pc set (pcs A B= E in normal form) that is a linear transformation of the same pc set heard in the trumpet trichord (pcs A D E=).\footnote{In m. 2 Webern wrote the ostinato, presumably still in the harp, in the fourth staff, as depicted in Example 4.2, probably to avoid crowding the bass clarinet line.} Of course, the bass clarinet’s E and B= are also necessary to complete the aggregate, one of Webern’s obvious priorities, but the choice of pc A in this motive suggests that he intentionally created the connection to the trumpet trichord.\footnote{Alternatively, the composer could have grouped pc F with the E and B= in the bass clarinet figure and still created a 3-5 pc set, but pc F is heard many times in the introduction and only as part of the ostinato.}

The composer’s penchant for presenting all twelve pcs within the introduction is manifest in this song, and the first aggregate is completed when the voice enters on c<\textsuperscript{1} at the end of m. 2, thereby eliding the introduction and the first phrase of the voice. The pc A is then heard for the second time immediately after the vocal entrance, completing the bass clarinet’s 3-5 pc set, as previously mentioned. Prior to the vocal entrance, only pcs F

\begin{footnote}
16\quad Meter and tempo changes could have shortened the potential length of the work, if it had been completed, and subsequent revisions also may have condensed it dramatically. The latter was certainly the case with “Wiese im Park,” the continuity draft (1917) of which, at 102 beats, is 30 percent shorter than the potential length of the longest sketch fragment (1916).

17\quad In m. 2 Webern wrote the ostinato, presumably still in the harp, in the fourth staff, as depicted in Example 4.2, probably to avoid crowding the bass clarinet line.

18\quad Alternatively, the composer could have grouped pc F with the E and B= in the bass clarinet figure and still created a 3-5 pc set, but pc F is heard many times in the introduction and only as part of the ostinato.
\end{footnote}
F< and B, appearing as f\textsuperscript{i} f< and b\textsuperscript{i}, were heard more than once, and these pitches appear in the motivically related and characteristically repetitive harp ostinato and oboe triplet (m. 1). After the introductory two measures, Webern continued to delineate sectional divisions through the completion of aggregates, although somewhat less clearly. During the first vocal phrase, from m. 2 beat 2 to the downbeat of m. 5, most pcs are heard at least twice, except pcs G and E, each of which appears only once. The composer was quite frugal with pc E; only three appear in the entire sketch, and one of these was deleted as part of the circled b\textsuperscript{i}-e\textsuperscript{2} dyad on beat 2 of m. 4. The e\textsuperscript{2} of this deleted dyad would have completed the piece’s second aggregate, and perhaps Webern deleted the dyad to delay the completion of the aggregate until after the line of poetry was complete. He replaced the deleted b\textsuperscript{i}-e\textsuperscript{2} dyad with another containing b= and a\textsuperscript{i}, representing two pcs that only appear once each in this section otherwise. After this revision the second aggregate is not complete until e\textsuperscript{i} (not clearly scored, but possibly still in the cello) is heard in the fourth staff at the end of m. 5. The e\textsuperscript{i} is preceded, however, by an eighth rest on the downbeat of that measure, seeming to indicate that the music after the rest is part of the next musical section. Certainly, the similar rests at the end of m. 2, which like those in m. 5 briefly reduce the music to a two-voice texture of vocalist and bass clarinet, clearly marks the end of the introduction. Like the voice’s first pitch in m. 2, the e\textsuperscript{i} in m. 5 serves to elide musical sections. The two beats of m. 6 encompass ten pitches that present ten different pcs, and the cleverly placed e\textsuperscript{i} at the end of m. 5 provides the eleventh, leaving only pc E= unheard in this brief musical space. Whether or not Webern intended to create an aggregate to introduce the second vocal phrase cannot be known, since it is at this point that the sketch breaks down, and pc E= does not reappear.

One of the most interesting characteristics of this sketch is the ostinato that begins in the harp and subtly transforms as it migrates among the other instruments. After an eighth-note rest and the voice’s entrance at the end of m. 2, the ostinato begins again in the clarinet, although now the figure is a chromatic upper-neighbor movement from f\textsuperscript{i} to g=\textsuperscript{1} that more closely resembles the oboe triplet of m. 1. The g=\textsuperscript{1} then is repeated (downbeat of m. 4) before the f\textsuperscript{i} returns. The g=\textsuperscript{1}.f\textsuperscript{i} figure sounds one last time in the
cello line, just before the voice completes the first phrase to very sparse accompaniment on the downbeat of m. 5. The result is a steady oscillation between pcs F and F<, expressed either as f'/f< or f'/g1, in a figure that travels from instrument to instrument throughout the first four measures of the piece.\textsuperscript{19} The ostinato is strongly audible in the first two measures, where it leaps in the bass against a largely sustained and rhythmically distinct background, but it is much less conspicuous in mm. 3 and 4, where it becomes a narrower, chromatic figure that moves in synchronicity with other accompaniment.

Related to this rising and falling semitone motive are several other brief upper-neighbor chromatic movements, such as the ornamental triplet b1'-c2-b1 in the oboe in m. 1, the c1'-d1=1-d1=1-c1 (not orchestrated) that parallels the clarinet line in mm. 3-4, and the b-c1'-b in the bass of m. 5. Other transformations of this figure also appear, such as the cello line in m. 3 that leaps down and then back up an octave and minor third in a linear gesture (b1'-g<g<-b1') that is similar in basic form to the two instrumental lines that move in parallel motion in mm. 3-4. The cello line’s first five pitches (b1'-g<g<-b1'-g1) are nearly identical to those of the previous oboe line (g2-b1-[c2]-b1-g1), with a few subtle changes.\textsuperscript{20} Like the oboe figure, the cello’s countermelody is heard against the harmonic background of sustained pcs D and E= . Finally, an expansion of the basic ostinato motive appears in the uppermost instrumental line of mm. 5-6, a five-note melodic figure that begins and ends on pc B= and has b1' as its penultimate pitch. The last three notes of this unorchestrated figure (d2-b1'-b=) are a subtle variation of the e=2-c2-b1' in the voice in m. 4. Although the patterns are slightly different, the similar contour, identical placement within the measure (the three eighth notes after the downbeat), and close proximity make the relationship clearly audible.

\textsuperscript{19}Shreffler’s \textit{Lyric Impulse}, 110-32, contains an entire chapter dedicated to a discussion of Webern’s use of ostinato in several Tral settings, all from 1917, but she discusses nothing similar to the treatment of the ostinato in 101-0582.

\textsuperscript{20}The sixth note of the cello melody, b=, is a major sixth below the preceding g1 (downbeat of m. 4), the same interval that introduces the oboe figure of m. 1.
PSS 103-0779

“Vallorbe” manuscript 103-0779 is a single-page, fragmentary pencil sketch, comprising at least seventeen measures of music for soprano voice, clarinet, glockenspiel, harp, and three or more strings, of which only the violin and viola are specified.\(^{21}\) The sketch was written on a 24-staff whole sheet of oblong-format music paper. If the page is turned over so that the “Vallorbe” setting is face down but remains right-side-up, then the paper manufacturer’s stamp appears upside-down in the upper right corner of the verso: J. E. & Co., No. 14, 24-staff. The seventeen measures that are definitely related to “Vallorbe” are written in condensed-score format on two systems of five and four staves, respectively.\(^{22}\) There is also a third four-staff system containing four measures that may be related to this song; this music will be discussed later. The uppermost system contains the first eight measures of music, but the instrumental staves are blank after m. 3, indicating that Webern again experienced difficulty composing an accompaniment after setting the first six syllables of the text. The second system contains only vocal music, except for a single four-note chord ($A_1$-E-A-f) that appears in the system’s fourth staff (the eleventh from the top) beneath the final note ($g^<1$) of the vocal line. A nearly identical chord appears at the same point in the continuity draft.\(^{23}\) The vocal line, which is heavily edited and difficult to interpret in some measures, particularly in m. 5 on the

\(^{21}\)The first complete measure of 103-0779 has a three-note chord in the bass ($B=-d=-a$) that is labeled “Str” (Streiche). In 103-0775 (page 1 of the continuity draft) the same three-note chord is given to the cello, viola, and violin. In 103-0779 the violin and viola are specified in m. 2, but the cello and double bass are never designated, although they are implied by some chords, including one that goes down to $A_1$.

\(^{22}\)Webern left two nearly empty staves (staves 6 and 7 from the top) between the first and second systems. The sixth staff is empty except for the instrumental indication “Harfe” written below the music of m. 3, and the seventh staff is empty except where the composer used it to write revisions of the vocal line in mm. 16-17. There are three blank staves between the second and third systems. There is an irregularly shaped stain, apparently caused by water or some other liquid, at the bottom edge of the page just right of center.

\(^{23}\)In 103-0779 the pitch $A$ is deleted in this tetrachord. In 103-0775 the chord is $A_1$ E B= f.
word “Glockenblumenkorb,” provides enough music to set the entire first stanza of the poem. The final layer of revisions in 103-0779 communicates a vocal line that is identical to that of the later continuity draft at its beginning but increasing dissimilar in its later measures.

The third system of 103-0779, also in condensed-score format, contains four measures of music for flute, bass clarinet, trombone, cello, and double bass. As shown in the transcription provided as Example 4.3, the third system’s upper staff is completely blank, except for a treble clef on the left, and the lower three staves are connected by barlines.\(^{24}\) Webern wrote the system on staves 15-18 (counting from the top), leaving three blank staves between the second and third systems. He had left only two blank staves between the first and second systems. This irregularity in format, combined with the more salient fact that the music of the second system contains a vocal line only, suggests that the music of the third system is not a continuation of the 103-0779 sketch of “Vallorbe,” but rather that it was created after the composer had abandoned that sketch.\(^{25}\) The third system does, however, appear to be an orchestral song sketch, for its format is identical to that of many other song manuscripts that were abandoned before the vocal line was written. One such abandoned song sketch, M. 219 (1917), is listed in the Works List of Chronicle (pp. 738-39) as an “Orchestral Song (no text),” and Shreffler has pointed out the existence of many more.\(^{26}\) The four-measure sketch in the third system of

\(^{24}\)Study of the Kraus sketches alone indicates that Webern was quite inconsistent in the use of barlines; i.e., we cannot assume that the uppermost staff of this system is non-instrumental, and therefore vocal, simply because he did not use barlines to connect it to the lower staves.

\(^{25}\)Work List C in Chronicle (pp. 740-41) numbers the measures in the 103-0779 “Vallorbe” sketch at 17, indicating that the Moldenhauers considered the music of the third system to be unrelated to the second “Vallorbe” sketch. Shreffler’s dissertation numbers the measures at 18, indicating that she drew the same conclusion, although she counted the measures slightly differently; see “Webern’s Trakl Settings,” 333.

\(^{26}\)In her discussion of Webern’s compositional process Shreffler wrote, “Sometimes the sketch gets no further than the instrumental introduction. Unless there is a word or phrase of the text, these instrumental fragments are unidentifiable; there are dozens of
"Vallorbe," M. 232, PSS 103-0779, mm. 18-21 (third system)

103-0779 does not appear in any catalog or works list and has not been discussed in the literature.

Although the third system of 103-0779 is not a continuation of that sketch, the music bears similarities to musical material in the “Vallorbe” continuity draft, especially mm. 17-22, suggesting that Webern reused manuscript 103-0779 to write a revision of the accompaniment in these measures. This is not surprising, since just over half of 103-0779, a 24-staff whole sheet, was blank when the composer began to create the continuity draft, and he was always frugal with his music paper. The transcription of mm. 17-22 of the continuity draft provided as Example 4.4 facilitates a comparison. In Example 4.4

such fragments scattered throughout the sketches.” See Lyric Impulse, 51. Appendix 2, “Webern Compositions and Fragments 1915-1921,” of Shreffler’s dissertation lists both M. 219 and another “song, no text” for voice and piano (p. 332). The latter sketch, dated “1917 or before” by Shreffler, is seven measures long and has no catalog number.

The measure numbers provided in Example 4.4 have been assigned with regard to the entire final layer of the four-page continuity draft. Measures 17-18 of the “Vallorbe” continuity draft are the last two measures of 103-0775, and mm. 19-22 are mm. 1-2 and 6-7 of 103-0777, the second page of the continuity draft. Measures 3-5 of 103-0777 have been circled (deleted) and rewritten in the original manuscript. These deleted measures are not included in Example 4.4. Bracketed manuscript numbers have been provided
after the cadence on “Orbe” on the downbeat of m. 17, the next note in the trombone is the e= on beat 2 of that measure. This is the same note that introduces the sixteenth-note figure, played by the double bass, in m. 18 (the first measure of the third system) of 103-0779 (Example 4.3). In Example 4.4 the lowest pitch on the downbeat of m. 18 is an A₁ quarter note, followed by a C eighth note with a G< above. The same three pcs appear contiguously, although reordered, in Example 4.3 m. 18 as the last three sixteenth notes of beat 2. The first of the sixteenth notes on beat 2, pc E, was written in Example 4.4 on the downbeat of m. 19 as e¹ above the held C-G< (and c<-f<) and then scratched out. This pitch is therefore shown in alternate notation. Of course, all of these pc relationships might be coincidental, yet the figure in m. 18 of 103-0779 (Example 4.3) is also similar in rhythm and basic motive to other musical gestures in the continuity draft. Example 4.5 provides transcriptions of three musical figures that appear in three different measures in the “Vallorbe” continuity draft. These three sixteenth-note figures, all of which, like the figure in Example 4.3 m. 18, begin with a rest, were written in the lowest bass-clef staff of the continuity draft, although two of the figures continue up into a treble clef staff, as shown in the example. Beyond the initial sixteenth rest and basic rhythm, several pitch class similarities link the figure in Example 4.3 with those of Example 4.5. In Example above the upper staff in Example 4.4.
In order to provide the first word (“Du”) of the vocal phrase, Example 4.6 begins with the last measure of 103-0775, even though this measure is presumably not affected by the revision. As indicated by the bracketed manuscript references above staves 1 and 2 in m. 19, the vocal line of mm. 19-22 is drawn from 103-0777 and the instrumental parts from 103-0779.

Example 4.5: “Vallorbe,” M. 232, continuity draft, comparison of similar motives

4.3 m. 19 the first four sixteenth notes form a 4-5 pc set (pcs G B C C< in normal form); in Example 4.5A, which shows the bass line of m. 4 from the first page of the continuity draft (103-0775), this same pc set appears on beat 3 (pcs A B= B E=). The pcs are ordered differently in these two sixteenth-note figures, but they both end with the tritone. Example 4.5B, the lower two staves of m. 12 from the second page of the continuity draft (103-0777), shares only the initial rest and basic form with the music of Example 4.3 m. 18, and Example 4.5C, two measures from the continuity draft’s last page (103-0776), is related to the music of Example 4.3 m. 18 by the contour of the first three sixteenth notes. The connections among these four sixteenth-note bass figures are the type of subtle correspondences that we would expect Webern to create among related figures in a single work. These musical relationships, along with the simple fact that the music of 103-0779’s third staff appears with other sketches of “Vallorbe,” strongly suggests that Webern may have returned to manuscript 103-0779 after he had created the continuity draft and reused that page to write a revision of mm. 17-22 of the later draft.

Example 4.6 combines the vocal music from mm. 18-21 of the continuity draft with the revised instrumental music of 103-0779 mm. 18-21. This version of these four measures presents an alternative that is tenable in some regards yet problematic in others.

---

28In order to provide the first word (“Du”) of the vocal phrase, Example 4.6 begins with the last measure of 103-0775, even though this measure is presumably not affected by the revision. As indicated by the bracketed manuscript references above staves 1 and 2 in m. 19, the vocal line of mm. 19-22 is drawn from 103-0777 and the instrumental parts from 103-0779.
Example 4.6: “Vallorbe,” M. 232, vocal line of PSS 103-0777 mm. 1-2 and 6-7 with instrumental parts from PSS 103-0779 mm. 18-21.

On the positive side, in this setting the first two notes of the voice share an ic 1 relationship with the accompaniment—specifically, in m. 18 the voice’s d¹ against the low c< (given to the bass clarinet in 103-0775) and in m. 19 the voice’s d² against the double bass’s e=. Equally plausible is the fermata that appears on the trombone’s a=¹ just after the voice sings the word “Ruh” (silence or rest), a word that is followed by a period in the poem. On the negative side, the combination of these parts leads to a high number of pitch doublings between the voice and accompaniment. Although brief, this doubling occurs four times in m. 19 alone: on beat 1 the voice’s d² against a D in the double bass, on beat 2 the voice’s a¹ against A¹ in the double bass, and on beat 3 both the voice’s g<¹ against the trilled f</g< in the bass clarinet and the b¹ against the B, presumably still in the double bass. The most implausible doubling occurs in m. 20, where the voice and trombone sustain the same pitch, b=¹. Finally, in m. 21 both the voice’s f¹ and b¹ are doubled an octave below by the trombone. These pitch doublings could be considered evidence that the instrumental music is indeed related to this section of the continuity draft, but obviously, if Webern intended to insert the instrumental music into the draft of “Vallorbe,” he probably would have rewritten the vocal line as well.
PSS 103-0775 through 103-0778: Continuity Draft

The continuity draft of “Vallorbe” is a four-page pencil sketch that provides an orchestral song setting of Kraus’s entire twelve-line poem. The first and fourth pages of the draft are actually the recto and verso sides of the same loose-leaf sheet, whereas the second and third pages are on two separate loose leaves, both with blank versos. Each of these three sheets is of a different paper type and will be described in more detail below. Undoubtedly due to the fact that the first and last pages are on the same sheet, the PSS microfilm copies of these manuscripts are not numbered in the musical order; the musical sequence is as follows: 103-0775 (page 1r), 103-0777 (page 2r), 103-0778 (page 3r), and finally 103-0776 (page 1v). All four sides of the heavily edited manuscript are written in condensed-score format with abbreviated instrumental indications. When all circled, scratched-out, or otherwise deleted and revised material is discounted, the resulting draft constitutes 60 measures of music for soprano voice, ranging from b to g\(^2\), and the following 14 instruments: clarinet, bass clarinet, trumpet, horn, trombone, violin, viola, cello, double bass, celesta, harp, glockenspiel, triangle, and timpani.

The first page of the “Vallorbe” continuity draft, 103-0775, contains 19 measures (plus an initial partial measure of one beat) arranged in three, three-staff systems and provides enough music to set the poem’s first stanza and the first word of the second, “Du.” All of the text set was written into the manuscript. 103-0775 is an eleven-staff, condensed-score draft. An edited reconstruction of the “Vallorbe” continuity draft is provided in Appendix 1. Friedrich Cerha has created heavily edited performance scores of both “Vallorbe” and “Vision des Erblindeten.” Cerha’s versions of these works were performed, along with several other Webern compositions, in Vienna on 15 December 1994 and again on 16 August 1997.

The Moldenhauers counted the measures at 63; see Chronicle, 740-41. In m. 14 of 103-0777 it appears that Webern originally set the second syllable of “alles” (second stanza, second line, ninth syllable) to the pitch a. He then wrote “(c)” on the staff above the soprano’s note to clarify. This may have been a simple error, since the pitch a appears immediately after this vocal note in a lower staff.

Webern left one blank staff between each system, thus using the whole page. In m. 5 the composer used the fourth, otherwise empty, staff to write two low string lines,
labeled simply “Str.,” creating a four-staff system in that one measure.

32 Counting every measure in 103-0777, regardless of deletion or revision, mm. 3-5 have been circled (deleted) and recomposed in mm. 6-7. As mentioned previously, the instrumental lines of mm. 1-2 and 6-7 may be superseded by the revisions written in the third system of 103-0779. Nearly all of the music in m. 10 has also been circled, and m. 11 appears to be a revision of that material. Finally, the last measure of 103-0777, m. 19, is superseded by the first measure of 103-0778, which resets the same text.

33 Webern left one blank staff between systems 1 and 2 and another between systems 2 and 3. In m. 6, the first measure of system 2, he used the empty staff beneath to rewrite a
probably at some later time, when he was gathering and organizing his sketches. The text of this page begins where 103-0775 left off, on the second word of the second stanza, “Sonntag,” and continues to “der Schöpfer die[sen],” the fourth syllable of the third line in the same stanza. Most of the text was written in the manuscript, although a few words are missing. The music of this page is less complete than that of the first page, and the extremely thin texture in some measures, often featuring the vocalist with a single instrument, may indicate that the conception of the piece rendered there is rudimentary and undeveloped. There are no dynamics or other expressive markings. Some abbreviated instrumental indications appear in the manuscript, but most of the instrumental lines on this page are not orchestrated.

The third page of the continuity draft, 103-0778, is a 6-staff, oblong-format half sheet, torn on the bottom and right edges. The paper manufacturer’s stamp appears upside down in upper right corner: J. E. & Co., No. 2, 12 staff. The verso is blank. The page contains eleven measures of music arranged in two three-staff systems. Although most of the text set on this page was written into the manuscript, the first three and last two vocal pitches have no text. The text that is present indicates that the music begins with “die[sen Kuß]” (second stanza, third line, fourth syllable), constituting a repetition of the last syllable of the previous page and a revision of its music. The vocal line ends with “die ver[weht]” (third stanza, first line, fifth syllable). The handwriting of this page is very clear, despite several circles, scratch-outs, and ample evidence of erasure. The composer also drew a small five-line staff with music in the right margin beside the third staff. An arrow indicates that the music written in this small hand-drawn staff was to trombone line, creating a four-staff system in that one measure. The third system of four staves has a blank second staff. There is no empty staff between systems 3 and 4.

Text declamation rhythms appear above the vocal staff in mm. 5 and 17, but the composer did not heed them in the final legible layer.

Counting all of the original measures, regardless of revisions, the measure count for this page is 12. As a result of revision and a change of meter, however, the tenth and eleventh measures were combined into one 3/4 measure and the barline between them scratched out.
replace the double bass line of m. 5. Most but not all of the instrumental parts in 103-0778 are clearly scored, including one reference to “Pauke” (timpani) in m. 5, although it is not clear what pitches or rhythm the instrument should play.\(^{36}\)

The fourth and final page of the “Vallorbe” continuity draft, 103-0776, is an eleven-staff, oblong-format half sheet that is the verso of 103-0775, the draft’s first page. 103-0776 contains 16 heavily revised measures of music in its final layer.\(^{37}\) The music is written in three systems of 4, 3, and 4 staves, respectively. As this was the last page of a draft, Webern drew the final double bar with his customary flourish and end-dated the draft “5. VIII 1918.” Although the first syllable, like the majority of the text, does not appear on this page, the vocal music obviously begins on “[ver]weht” (third stanza, first line, fifth syllable) and completes the setting of the third stanza. The vocal music is well developed, but the accompaniment seems incomplete in some measures, and there are only three abbreviated instrumental indications, leaving nearly all of the music without scoring. In addition to single references to clarinet and harp, the abbreviation “Trgl.” (triangle) appears in m. 4., but there is no percussion rhythm in the measure. The last measure before the double bar, which is actually the penultimate notated measure, contains eight small sixteenth notes, all written on the middle line of the staff, that might be intended for percussion, but no instrument is designated.

**Composition by Aggregate or “ Aggregate Phrasing”**

Analysis of the continuity draft of “Vallorbe,” especially from the perspective of compositional process, must begin with an explanation of the method by which Webern achieved the fundamental layer of the draft: namely, the delineation of each poetic and musical phrase through a corresponding aggregate formation, a technique I refer to as

---

\(^{36}\)The imprecise notation of percussion parts in sketches is common for the composer; these particular details were usually finalized during the fair copy stage.

\(^{37}\)A count of every measure, regardless of revisions or repetition of text, totals at least 19. Some meter changes and scratched-out barlines make the count problematic, and the music continues for three beats (one full measure) after the concluding double bar.
"aggregate phrasing." While several of Webern’s Kraus songs present an aggregate in the introduction or in select phrases, the continuity draft of “Vallorbe” does so with a regularity that is unprecedented. In the draft every phrase of Kraus’s poem is underlaid by a corresponding pc collection of at least eleven pcs and in most cases by a complete chromatic set in which the elements are unordered and freely repeated. Furthermore, these aggregate phrases are usually clearly associated with punctuation within the poem and are explicitly delimited by the rests written in the manuscript. Although while sketching Webern often did not bother to fill in empty space with rests, in the “Vallorbe” continuity draft the rests that he did include often mark the boundaries of aggregates. Study of the draft and of the various legible layers of revision reveals that in the earlier layers the composer purposefully fashioned these aggregate phrases throughout the piece and that in subsequent revisions he often deleted pitches and otherwise transformed the musical material in a manner that obscures the original chromatic background. I do not suggest that it was Webern’s intention to conceal his compositional procedure, only that the revisions occasionally did so. For the purpose of studying this feature of the sketch, an edited reconstruction of the “Vallorbe” continuity draft is offered as Examples 4.7, 4.9, 4.10 and 4.12. In these examples bold lines have been added to the score to demarcate the various aggregates or incomplete collections that will be discussed, and these subsections thus enclosed in boxes have been enumerated 1 through 24.

Unlike the earliest sketch on “Vallorbe” (101-0582), in which the first aggregate is completed upon the voice’s initial entrance, thereby distinguishing the introduction

---

38 The aggregate analyses of the “Vallorbe” continuity draft (Examples 4.7, 4.9, 4.10 and 4.12) include only those rests and accidentals that appear in the original manuscript. In order to simplify the example all dynamics and other expressive markings superfluous to this discussion have been eliminated. Measure numbers have been added, and each manuscript’s PSS microfilm catalog number has been included in brackets above the measure that is the first of that page: for instance, [103-0775] above m. 0. In several measures notes that were circled, scratched out, or otherwise negated have been included in alternate notation (empty, slashed noteheads), such as those appearing in the third staff of m. 6 (b=7, g= and g=1). These alternate versions are selective—i.e., the reconstruction does not show every deleted note—and will be described in the discussion below.
from that which follows, in the later versions (103-0779 and the continuity draft) Webern delayed completion of the first aggregate until the e\textsuperscript{1} in m. 4 on the last syllable of “Glockenblumenkorb.” As a result the short introduction (mm. 0-1) and the entire first line of the poem are joined in a single aggregate phrase. The first aggregate and phrase are labeled 1 in Example 4.7. This compositional scheme is most readily apparent in the fragmentary sketch 103-0779, for in the continuity draft there is an earlier e on the second beat of the busy bass clarinet figure in m. 4. In 103-0779, the first five measures of which are shown in transcription as Example 4.8, the bass clarinet part was not yet composed, and both alternate vocal settings of “Glockenblumenkorb,” written one above the other in staves 1 and 2, end on pc E. The setting on the second staff of 103-0779 is the vocal line ultimately used in continuity draft. 103-0779 also reveals that Webern revised mm. 2-4 and rejected earlier appearances of pc E at least twice, once in a chord on the downbeat of m. 3, circled for deletion in staves 4 and 5, and once in the glockenspiel’s moving figure.\textsuperscript{39} In m. 3 the glockenspiel melody seen in the third staff is the version adopted later in the continuity draft. The revisions in 103-0779 suggest that Webern did not begin the sketching process with a decision to delineate the first vocal phrase with an aggregate completed on pc E, but rather that he arrived at this solution during the process of composition and revision.\textsuperscript{40} The configuration of the first aggregate was sketched,

\textsuperscript{39}At least one e\textsuperscript{1} also may have appeared as the setting of the second and/or third syllable of “Glockenblumenkorb” in one of the earlier layers of staff 1 m. 4. My most confident reading of the uppermost layer is seen in Example 4.8 in normal notation, whereas the alternate notation offers other possibilities. Unfortunately, several layers of revision have rendered the second and third notes of this measure very difficult to interpret, and my transcription at that point is not entirely confident. My interpretation of staff 2 m. 4, however, is very confident and verified by the continuity draft.

\textsuperscript{40}In the earliest legible version of 103-0779—created by combining the vocal staff with the music of staves 4 and 5 (staves 2 and 3 contain revisions)—the first aggregate would have been complete on the downbeat of m. 3 with the tetrachord that includes e. It may be that the composer then circled the tetrachord and delayed the resolution until the glockenspiel played pc E on the last sixteenth note of beat 1. He then revised the glockenspiel line of m. 3 (staff 3) to avoid pc E, delaying the resolution until m. 4.

In an early and revised layer of m. 6 Webern used a similar offbeat, sixteenth-note
Example 4.7: “Vallorbe,” M. 232, continuity draft, mm. 0-14, aggregate phrases

rhythmic figure to delay the resolution of aggregate 3. In m. 6 the aggregate’s last pc, B=, appears as the first of two sixteenths on the upbeat of beat 1.
Counting all pcs in mm. 0-3 and the vocal line of m. 4—i.e., only those musical figures that were retained from 103-0779—the three pcs that appear only once in this collection, pcs D E and G, are three of the first four pcs in the bass clarinet figure of m. 4. Although pcs are often redundantly expressed in the aggregates that Webern created in his “Vallorbe” setting, it seems that he endeavored to attain at least a minimal level of chromatic equality. The first four pitches of the bass clarinet countermelody also have a pc set relationship with the introductory clarinet melody, mm. 0-1, both of which form a 4-13 pc set (pcs C E= F G= in mm. 0-1 and pcs C< D E G in m. 4).

Example 4.8: “Vallorbe,” M. 232, PSS 103-0779, mm. 0-5, diplomatic transcription

However, before he started the continuity draft. In the first page of the continuity draft the moving bass clarinet figure of m. 4 obscures an intention that is clearer in the earlier version.

In m. 4 of the continuity draft (Example 4.7) the eleven-note bass clarinet figure alone provides nearly all of the second aggregate, repeating c\textsuperscript{4} and including nine other pcs—all but pcs G<\textsuperscript{1} and F.\textsuperscript{41} The missing pcs immediately appear in m. 5 as g<\textsuperscript{1}, the first note of the second staff (not orchestrated), and f\textsuperscript{5}, the second pitch of the vocal line, thereby completing the second aggregate with an elision to the next phrase. Of course, pc F appeared earlier along with the bass clarinet figure as the fourth vocal note in m. 4 (f\textsuperscript{5})

\textsuperscript{41} Counting all pcs in mm. 0-3 and the vocal line of m. 4—i.e., only those musical figures that were retained from 103-0779—the three pcs that appear only once in this collection, pcs D E and G, are three of the first four pcs in the bass clarinet figure of m. 4. Although pcs are often redundantly expressed in the aggregates that Webern created in his “Vallorbe” setting, it seems that he endeavored to attain at least a minimal level of chromatic equality. The first four pitches of the bass clarinet countermelody also have a pc set relationship with the introductory clarinet melody, mm. 0-1, both of which form a 4-13 pc set (pcs C E= F G= in mm. 0-1 and pcs C< D E G in m. 4).
on “-men-”), so the second aggregate is actually very neatly accomplished on the
downbeat of m. 5, as is diagramed in Example 4.7.

These orderly subdivisions, in which the aggregate is completed either by the last
pitch or pitches of a musical phrase or by the first pitch of the next, is a characteristic of
most phrases in the continuity draft of “Vallorbe.” Furthermore, these aggregate phrases
nearly always coincide with the formal structure and punctuation of the poem. For
example, the first aggregate is completed immediately before the comma that ends the
poem’s first line, and the second aggregate is completed by a pitch that is simultaneous
with the first word of the poem’s second line. Also noteworthy are the rests in the
accompaniment: for example, the sixteenth- and eighth-note rests occurring on the
downbeats of mm. 4 and 5, respectively, were placed both before and after the bass
clarinet figure that presents most of the second aggregate.

Aggregate 3 provides a fairly clear example of Webern’s use of aggregates in
most phrases of the “Vallorbe” continuity draft, although in the draft’s final layer the
aggregate is incomplete. Aggregate 3 begins on the downbeat of m. 5 and is separated
from the preceding music by the rests described above. The music of staves 2 and 4 is
preceded by empty measures in the manuscript, as is shown in Example 4.7. This
aggregate ends on beat 1 of m. 6, where the harp plays A on the downbeat (staff 3) and
b = 2 appears as the first of two sixteenth notes on the second half of the beat (staff 2, not
scored). These two sixteenth notes are shown in Example 4.7 in alternate notation,
because they are both scratched out and circled in the manuscript. After the deletion of
this pc B=, aggregate 3 remains incomplete. There is also a g= 1 quarter note as the
syncopated quarter note beginning on the second half of beat 1, which is also scratched
out but not circled. Finally, a g= quarter note, seen in Example 4.7 in standard notation,
appears at that point, as well, although in the manuscript it is partially under or, I believe,
on top of the scribble (not shown in Example 4.7) and is also circled. Although the
lightness of the composer’s pencil script hinders a definite assessment of sequence in
these revisions, it is logical to assume that Webern first wrote the two sixteenth notes
(b= 2 g= 2) and then, after circling them, wrote in the g= 1. He then scratched out
everything at that point in the measure and wrote in the g=. Whether he then circled the g= to indicate that it should remain (necessary since it falls on top of the scribble) or whether the circle is one of deletion cannot be determined. \(^{42}\) Regardless of what should be maintained in the final layer, in at least one, and probably the earliest, layer aggregate 3 included the necessary pc B= and was complete.

Aggregate 3 sets the first four syllables of the poem’s second line, and the rests in m. 6 coincide with the comma that follows “Orbe.” \(^{43}\) As will be demonstrated, most of the song’s aggregate phrases provide settings for six syllables of text, even in those poetic lines that are not bifurcated by commas, yet Webern reacted to the metric disruption in poetic line 2 by isolating the first four evenly stressed syllables, “Ursprung der Orbe,” setting them to quarter notes and completing the aggregate to resolve the musical phrase. He interpreted the next two words, “der Welt,” as an articulated iambic foot and combined them with the last six syllables of line 2 to form aggregate 4. Aggregate 4 begins on the d\(^2\) played by the cello in m. 6, which is separated from the preceding music by the sixteenth rest awkwardly inserted above the harp triad. The composer must have added the sixteenth rest after circling the violin’s d\(^2\) and c<\(^1\) on beat 3 of m. 5, where they originally continued the pattern of chromatically descending minor ninths, and moving these pcs to the next measure. The completion of aggregate 4 requires all three notes that appear on beat 1 of m. 9.

The fifth aggregate corresponds with the first half of the first stanza’s third line, beginning with the b\(^1\) that underlays “du” at the end of m. 9, although it might be seen as beginning on the g\(^1\) at the end of m. 9 staff 2. The first four pitches of the vocal line in this phrase share not only a melodic contour and starting pitch with the vocal line of mm.

\(^{42}\)There is also ample evidence of erasure in this area of the manuscript, so other stages of the revision are undoubtedly lost.

\(^{43}\)In staff 3 no rest appears after the E-A-e= triad on beat 1; something was scratched out on beat 2, however, possibly a rest. The d\(^2\)-c<\(^2\) cello figure is definitely a revision, as is suggested by the odd placement of the sixteenth rest above the triad, as well as by the relatively darker script. Webern may have scratched out a rest on beat 2 when adding the cello line.
Before the deletion of the b\textsuperscript{1} eighth note on the downbeat of m. 14 (staff 3), seen in alternate notation in Example 4.7, a 4-4 set (pcs B = B D E = in mm. 1-2 and pcs B C E = E in mm. 9-11). Aggregate 5 is complete on the f\textsuperscript{2} on the first syllable of “Vallorbe,” although the outlining in Example 4.7 includes the entire word, since the following e\textsuperscript{1} affects the completion of neither this nor the subsequent aggregate. Likewise, the g\textsuperscript{1} that is simultaneous with the b\textsuperscript{1} on “du,” and indeed all four eighth notes in staff 2 of m. 9, may be included or excluded from aggregate 5, as may the four sixteenth notes played by the bass clarinet in m. 12, without affecting the overall composition of aggregate 5 or the incomplete collection that follows. It is interesting to note, however, that the four eighth notes in m. 9 and the four sixteenth notes in m. 12 frame aggregate 5 in a pair of descending 4-4 pc sets (pcs F < G G < B and B C C < E).\textsuperscript{44} The four sixteenth notes of m. 12 also share a clearly audible pattern of ic 1 followed by pcs E and C < with the instrumental line (at least partially in the celesta) that immediately preceded it in the second staff.\textsuperscript{45}

In a manner strikingly similar to aggregate 4, aggregate 6 remains incomplete in the final layer of the continuity draft, although it appears that Webern created a complete aggregate in the earliest legible layer. Aggregate 6 sets the second half of the first stanza’s third line, beginning in m. 12 with an a’ on “das” and the simultaneous harp tetrachord and ending on the downbeat of m. 14 on the second word of the next line, “Thal.”\textsuperscript{46} This musical phrase is characterized by the brightly octatonic, pizzicato pentachord played three times by the harp and strings. The eleven-pitch class set of the draft’s final layer is complete on the last beat of m. 13, where the voice’s f<\textsuperscript{1} and the bass

\textsuperscript{44}Before the deletion of the b= eighth note on the downbeat of m. 14 (staff 3), seen in alternate notation in Example 4.7, a 4-4 set (pcs B= B C E=) appeared there as well, meaning that there were 4-4 sets at the beginning, middle, and end of the poem’s line 3.

\textsuperscript{45}If the f<\textsuperscript{2} of m. 9 is included, then aggregate 5 also contains a seven-pitch palindrome in the second staff (f<\textsuperscript{2} g<\textsuperscript{1} a<\textsuperscript{1} a=\textsuperscript{1} g<\textsuperscript{1} f<\textsuperscript{2}).

\textsuperscript{46}Just as the vocal settings of poetic lines 1 and 3 begin with two versions of the 4-7 pc set, the settings of lines 2 and 3 both end with versions of this set (pcs A= A C D= in mm. 8-9 and pcs C C< E F in m. 12-13), although in the latter case these portions of the vocal lines do not share common pitches or a melodic contour.
G appear for the first time in the phrase. To conclude the phrase at this point would, of course, coincide with the punctuation and stanzaic structure of the poem and end the phrase with an elision into the next. The rests in staves 1 and 3 certainly suggest an end to the phrase, yet the missing twelfth pc, again pc B=, was on the downbeat of m. 14, where pcs G and F< also appear again. In Example 4.7 the b= in m. 14 is seen in alternate notation because Webern circled the eighth note and thus left the aggregate incomplete. The next pc B= does not appear until m. 15, well into the next phrase of text.

Example 4.9 provides an aggregate analysis of mm. 13-32 of the “Vallorbe” draft. Although lines 2 and 3 of the poem were set to two aggregates each, the fourth and final line of the first stanza is set to a single complete aggregate, much as was the first line, with which it shares meter and end rhyme (“[Glockenblumen]korb” in m. 4 and “Orbe” in m. 18). This, despite the fact that line 4 is also divided in the middle by a comma. Since aggregates 6 and 7 may be properly viewed as overlapping, the latter phrase and aggregate begins with the f< on “du,” the first word of poetic line 4, although excluding those pcs necessary for the completion of the previous aggregate would not leave aggregate 7 incomplete. Most pcs of aggregate 7 are presented redundantly, making the eventual resolution of the aggregate on A1, the lowest note of a sustained bass chord in m. 18, all the more striking and all the less coincidental. The last pitch of the seventh aggregate does not elide this phrase with the next, but rather it is complete simultaneously with the last word of the poetic line. An alternate reading of this section could divide aggregate 7 in two smaller collections, observing the comma in the text, as was done previously in lines 2 and 3. The bipartite division of the larger aggregate would also coincide with the eighth rest in the second staff on the downbeat of m. 16. If aggregate 7 as shown in Example 4.9 is divided between mm. 15 and 16 into two pc collections,
Example 4.9: “Vallorbe,” M. 232, continuity draft, mm. 13-32, aggregate phrases

making the division at the comma in the text, the resulting pc collections are not complete aggregates. These subsets of aggregate 7 are shown in Example 4.9 by a vertical dashed line. The first half, containing eleven different pitches, is missing two pcs, F and, of course, A. The second half, containing 16 different pitches, is missing only pc D, which
The countermelody of m. 5 cannot be an alternate vocal line because its rhythm does not match the number of syllables in the text, and in m. 15 the countermelody’s lowest note would expand the vocal range to a, presumably too low for a soprano.

Perhaps Webern revised the vocal line in order to avoid the numerous pitch doublings, discussed earlier, that result when the vocal setting of “Sonntag der Natur” shown in Example 4.9 mm. 20-21 (sketched in the uppermost staff in manuscript 103-0777) is combined with the revised instrumental music found in the third system of 103-0779 (Example 4.3).
mm. 20-21). If the melody of staff 2 does represent a revised vocal line, then Webern either meant to delay the completion of the aggregate until beat 2 of m. 21 or he simply added the B where he had room, even though it is intended to sound on the downbeat.\(^{50}\)

The second half of the poem’s fifth line is set to an incomplete chromatic collection that begins at the end of m. 21 on “hier” \(c^1\) and ends on “Ruh” in m. 23. This collection is missing pcs E= and G; the pc G, however, appeared at least twice in an earlier version of these measures. The alternate notation in Example 4.9 shows that in m. 22 the composer deleted a \(g^1\) from the \(e^1-g^1\) dyad on beats 2 and 3 and that in m. 23 he scratched out the \(e-g-c^1\) triad on beat 2.\(^{51}\) The missing pc E= does not appear in these measures in the manuscript, but it does appear on the word “Zeit” on the downbeat of m. 25. For this reason, aggregate 9 encapsulates the last eighth note of m. 21 through the downbeat of m. 25, despite the fact that this violates the punctuation and stanzaic structure of the text. In line 2, which is identical with line 6 with regard to meter and punctuation, “Ursprung der Orbe” was originally set as an independent aggregate phrase, although the aggregate was then obscured by revisions. Why Webern would have treated “Ursprung der Zeit!” in line 6 differently is unknown. It seems unlikely that Webern would have ignored the period after “Ruh” and then completed the aggregate after the first four syllables of the next line, so aggregate 9 in Example 4.9 may not reflect the composer’s conception of these measures. Measure 24 and possibly other measures in this section were left incomplete, and much of the compositional process, as well as the composer’s concept of the final version, remains unclear.

\(^{50}\)Measures 19-21 remain a very difficult section to analyze, and I believe that what we have in the manuscripts was subject to further revision and is not complete. As was mentioned in the earlier discussion of 103-0779, the sketches in the third system of that manuscript might have been intended to replace the instrumental parts in mm. 19-22 of the continuity draft. It is worthy of note, however, that this instrumental line presents a complete aggregate in mm. 20-21 without being set with either vocal line.

\(^{51}\)In the manuscript (103-0777) the revised trombone part was written underneath the earlier version in the otherwise empty fourth staff of the second system.
After m. 24 the following four aggregate formations again become quite clear. Aggregate 10 is distinguished from the previous phrase by an eighth rest in the instruments on the downbeat of m. 25 and by a quarter rest in the voice on the downbeat of m. 26.\(^{52}\) It is separated from the following aggregate by rests in both the voice and the instruments on the downbeat of m. 28. Unlike the setting of line 2, in which the composer set the last 8 syllables to a single aggregate despite an intervening comma, in line 6 he strictly adhered to the punctuation and isolated the words “So hat” in a complete aggregate. Both the f\(^3\) on “hat” and the sixteenth-note e\(^{-1}\) that immediately precedes it in the harp are necessary to complete the aggregate, and the four sixteenth notes that follow the e\(^{-1}\) are redundant. The last half of poetic line 6 is set in aggregate 11. As mentioned previously, it is separated from aggregate 10 by the rests on the downbeat of m. 28, and the aggregate ends when pcs D and G, expressed as d and g, sound repeatedly among the sixteenth-note tetrachords in m. 31. This aggregate phrase is not separated from the next with rests in the accompaniment, although it is, of course, separated by rests in the voice, as is nearly every phrase in the piece. The oscillating sixteenth-note tetrachords that conclude aggregate 11 can be combined with the short instrumental interlude in mm. 31-32 to form yet another aggregate. Aggregate 12 is suggested by the rests in the accompaniment in m. 30 that separate the sixteenth-note tetrachords from the preceding music. It is complete on the d\(^{-1}\) that is the penultimate pitch of the accompaniment in m. 32. Once again, a rest on the downbeat of m. 33 staff 3 marks the end of this aggregate.

Example 4.10 continues the aggregate analysis of the “Vallorbe” draft, reproducing mm. 32-51. Aggregate 13 sets the first half of poetic line 7 plus one syllable of the next. The instrumental music of aggregate 13 is set off from the music both before and after by rests on the downbeats of mm. 33 and 36.\(^ {53}\) The vocal line is separated from that of the previous phrase by a quarter rest on the downbeat of m. 32. The eighth rest in

\(^{52}\)In the manuscript the vocal line contains no rest on beat 2 of m. 25, although the e\(^{-1}\) on “Zeit” is clearly a quarter note.

\(^{53}\)In the manuscript no rest appears in m. 33 staff 2, but the new bass clef (which Webern wrote in m. 33 and not before) and the > on c did not allow room for one.
Example 4.10: “Vallorbe,” M. 232, continuity draft, mm. 30-48, aggregate phrases

the vocal line in m. 35 does not correspond with a punctuation in the text, since line 7 is the first line in the poem to have none, yet the poetic meter of line 7 is similar to that of lines 1, 3 and 4, all of which are bifurcated by commas. The aggregate's last pitch, e¹ on “der,” elides this phrase into the second half of line 7 and therefore occurs after the eighth
rest in that measure. The second half of line 7 is set by aggregate 14, which begins, of course, on the e\textsuperscript{1} vocal note at the end of m. 35 and continues until it elides with line 8 on “hier,” set to e\textsuperscript{2} on the downbeat of m. 39. The pitch that completes the aggregate is the a in the dyad of the second staff. The end of aggregate 14 is not separated by rests from the vocal or instrumental music that follows,\textsuperscript{54} and the final pc A is not in the vocal line, the bass, or otherwise prominent, therefore my reading of this aggregate may not represent the composer’s intention. There are numerous erasures and multiple layers of revision in mm. 36 and 38, as well as clef problems earlier in the phrase, so my reading of some of the pitches may be inaccurate, and, once again, the manuscript might not reflect a complete conception.

Aggregate 15, as seen in the final layer of the draft, is a little problematic, because it is not complete until the b=\textsuperscript{1} played by the bass clarinet in m. 41 after the eighth rests in both the voice and instrumental parts. It appears, however, that the composer originally created an aggregate that isolated the first four words of line 8, “hier saß der Gott,” in a complete aggregate, much as he did “Ursprung der Orbe” in mm. 5-6. This, despite the fact that there is no comma in line 8. If it were not for the delayed pc B=, the d\textsuperscript{1} on “Gott” in m. 40 and the g\textsuperscript{1} and c\textsuperscript{2} that occur on the same beat (staff 2) would complete the aggregate. A large eighth rest, written over other circled pitches in m. 40 as represented in the diplomatic transcription in Example 4.11, supports this reading, as does an earlier version of the vocal line of m. 39.\textsuperscript{55} An erased and overwritten earlier version of the vocal line included a b=\textsuperscript{1} on the syllable “der” at the end of the measure; the erased note’s accidental is still visible in the manuscript. This b=\textsuperscript{1} would have taken the place of the

\textsuperscript{54}There is an eighth rest that was scratched out in the vocal line on the downbeat of m. 39. Another large eighth rest appears in parentheses above the barline of the vocal staff between mm. 38 and 39. Webern obviously intended to place a rest somewhere between these two vocal phrases. There is a great deal of revision in the vocal line of m. 39, although the changes seem to be primarily rhythmic.

\textsuperscript{55}In the original manuscript the first eighth rest in m. 41 is written over the eighth-note b\textsuperscript{1}, as shown. Measures 40-41 are in the first system, which has a bass clef, and mm. 41-43 are in the second, which has no clef.
As is shown in Example 4.11, the b<sup>1</sup> was in the bass clarinet line of m. 41, but an eighth rest was written over it, and the b<sup>1</sup> was moved to the end of m. 40. The placement of the b<sup>1</sup> to the far right in m. 40 indicates that this change is in the final layer of revisions, after both the circled a<sup>1</sup>-g<sup>=1</sup> eighth notes and the eighth rest that is written over them.

No rest appears in the vocal line in the manuscript. See Example 4.11 m. 43.

Aggregate 16 provides another interesting example of an aggregate that was obscured by substantial revision. The resulting eleven-pitch class collection in this phrase begins in m. 40 after the eighth rest in the voice, includes the b<sup>1</sup> eighth note in the second staff of the same measure, and continues until the quarter rest in the glockenspiel in m. 43, thereby providing a setting of the last eight syllables of the second stanza. Here, as at the end of the first stanza, the musical phrase resolves without eliding into the text of

---

<sup>56</sup>As is shown in Example 4.11, the b<sup>1</sup> was in the bass clarinet line of m. 41, but an eighth rest was written over it, and the b<sup>1</sup> was moved to the end of m. 40. The placement of the b<sup>1</sup> to the far right in m. 40 indicates that this change is in the final layer of revisions, after both the circled a<sup>1</sup>-g<sup>=1</sup> eighth notes and the eighth rest that is written over them.

<sup>57</sup>No rest appears in the vocal line in the manuscript. See Example 4.11 m. 43.
the next stanza. In this phrase the last note of the vocal line does not provide closure to the collection; the d¹ f¹ d¹ on “lac de Joux” represent pcs that appeared earlier in this rather pc-redundant vocal line. Instead the composer created a musical correlation between “lac de Joux,” the last three words of poetic line 8, and the three-syllable word “aufgedrückt” at the end of the previous line, set in m. 38 to f¹ d¹ f¹. Although collection 16 remains incomplete, missing pc E, the phrase finds closure in pcs G and F<, which sound twice in m. 43 as components of the g³-c<³-f<² triplets. These repeating triplets herald a rhythmic motive that is characteristic of the third part of the song, appearing next in m. 48, much as the trichords of mm. 16-17 at the end of the first part foreshadowed the sustained bass chords of the second.

Manuscript 103-0778, the third page of the “Vallorbe” continuity draft, reveals that at some early stage Webern constructed an aggregate between mm. 40 and 43. As Example 4.11 shows, in the earlier layer, still easily legible in the manuscript, the phrase concluded in m. 43 with the strong presentation of pcs G and F< by the trombone (staff 2). Although the musical figure is very different from that of the final layer (written after the scratched-out barline), the consequence for the aggregate is the same. More importantly, the third staff, which is not orchestrated and has no clef, provides the pc E that is missing in the final layer, regardless of whether the figure is in bass or treble clef. If in treble clef e² is the first pitch of the figure, and if in bass clef E is the last. The scratched-out barline after the original m. 43 and the 3/4 time signature written between staves 1 and 2 suggest that the circle in m. 43 is intended to delete both figures in the second and third staves.58 Again, the composer appears to have deleted material that completed an aggregate that originally delineated the musical phrase.

Aggregate 17 provides another very clear example of an aggregate from which a pc has been eliminated. As shown in m. 43 of both Examples 4.10 and 4.11 the first word of the poem’s third stanza, once again “Du,” was originally set to f¹ and then

---

58My interpretation of the final layer of this draft condenses the last two measures of Example 4.11 into a single measure (m. 43) that includes the vocalist’s d¹ (“Joux”) and c¹ (“Du”) and the two glockenspiel triplets.
changed to c\textsuperscript{1}.\textsuperscript{59} In the earlier setting the entire first line of the third stanza was set to an aggregate that was complete on the line’s last word, “Wahn,” set to g\textsuperscript{1} in m. 47, but the removal of the f\textsuperscript{1} at the beginning of the phrase leaves the aggregate incomplete. Webern did not interrupt with a rest any voice of this very contrapuntal phrase, despite the comma after “Gnade.” The aggregate is clearly delineated from the following phrase, however, by the eighth rests in both the first and second staves of m. 47. This phrase also constitutes one of only three aggregates in the song that sets a complete 12-syllable line of text. The others are the aggregates 1 and 7, underlaying poetic lines 1 and 4, respectively.

The first half of the poem’s tenth line is set to aggregate 18, which begins after the eighth rests in the voice and instruments in m. 47 and is complete in m. 49 where G\textsubscript{1} and B=\textsubscript{1} sound in the bass on beats 1 and 2. In this case the completion of the aggregate does not necessarily mark the end of the musical phrase, which could be expanded to include the A= and the clarinet figure of m. 49 without affecting the completion of the following aggregate. The rests in the instruments on the downbeat of m. 50 suggest such an interpretation. The second half of line 10 provides another example of an aggregate that is complete slightly ahead of the point that might be called the end of the phrase, again with reference to the rests. In aggregate 19, however, the vocal line does provide an element in the aggregate’s completion, when f<\textsuperscript{1} underlays “Zeit” on the downbeat of m. 51. The other pitches involved in the phrase’s resolution are c\textsuperscript{1} and g\textsuperscript{1}, also on beat 1 of that measure. As Example 4.10 shows, in an earlier layer of manuscript 103-0776, the last page of the “Vallorbe” continuity draft, the second syllable of “entstand” in m. 50 was originally set to f\textsuperscript{1}. In that version the d\textsuperscript{1} on the second eighth note of the first beat of m. 51 would have been the sole representative of that pitch class and would have also served to complete the aggregate. The manner in which the m. 51 eighth notes move from c\textsuperscript{1} to d\textsuperscript{1}-g\textsuperscript{1} and then back to c\textsuperscript{1}-f\textsuperscript{1}, as well as the fact that pcs C, G and D (the latter in the earlier version only) all factor in the resolution of the aggregate, is reminiscent of the oscillating sixteenth-note figure of m. 31. Both of these figures occur beneath the last aggregate.

\textsuperscript{59}Example 4.11 includes the letter notation that Webern inserted to clarify the pitch.
The revision of the vocal line that made the d\textsuperscript{1} in m. 51 the second pc D in aggregate 19, and therefore negated its status as part of the aggregate’s resolution (and left the aggregate incomplete by removing pc F\textsuperscript{1}), actually increased the similarity between the eighth-note figure of m. 51 and the sixteenth-note figure of m. 31. In m. 31 the pitches that resolve the aggregate are d and g, which alternate, whereas the other pitches in the figure are redundant in the aggregate. In m. 51 the pitches c\textsuperscript{1} and g\textsuperscript{1} alternate, whereas d\textsuperscript{1} and f\textsuperscript{8} are redundant.

Example 4.12 completes the aggregate analysis of the “Vallorbe” continuity draft. Aggregate 20 sets the first half of the poem’s eleventh line, beginning in m. 51 after the sixteenth rest in the vocal line, the second eighth rest in staff 2, and on beat 2 of staff 3. The aggregate is complete in m. 52 when g< e\textsuperscript{1} and f\textsuperscript{2} sound on beat 1. Line 11 of the poem contains no punctuation until the period after the last word, “Ewigkeit,” and although Webern completed an aggregate in the first half of the line on the word “still,” he did not interrupt the vocal line with a rest at that point. There are oddly placed eighth rests in both the second and third staves of m. 52, not shown in Example 4.12, and they appear to mark the end of the aggregate. Example 4.13 provides a diplomatic transcription of m. 52 as it appears in the manuscript. The lack of beams and the odd placement of some notes makes it difficult to determine the rhythmic relationship of the various musical figures, but there is an eighth rest in the second staff after the triad that is stemmed together between the staves 2 and 3 and contains the notes g< e\textsuperscript{1} and a\textsuperscript{1}. The other pitch necessary to complete the aggregate, f\textsuperscript{2}, appears to fall on the second half of beat 1, yet it is to the left of the aforementioned triad and directly beneath the c\textsuperscript{1} of the voice. My interpretation of m. 52 can be seen in Example 4.12, but there are other possibilities.

The aggregate phrase enumerated as 21 in Example 4.12, encompassing the last two beats of m. 52 through the first dotted quarter note of m. 54 and setting the last half of poetic line 11, forms an incomplete aggregate. Eleven of the twelve pcs are presented very quickly during beats 2 and 3 of m. 52, but pc G does not appear. The a on the last syllable of the second line in their respective stanzas, so perhaps Webern sought to create a subtle musical connection between the two formally connected phrases.\textsuperscript{60}
Example 4.12: “Vallorbe,” M. 232, continuity draft, mm. 51-60.

eighth note of m. 52 (staff 3) is written over another note that may have been g, but the earlier pitch is not legible. Even if the a in m. 52 is actually g, the pcs in both the voice and the instruments in m. 53-54 are all expressed earlier in the phrase, so there would be no strong resolution of the aggregate. The fact that there is no instrumental music in m. 54 may indicate that this measure was never completed, but the solo vocal texture
Webern’s use of the solo vocal texture in mm. 53-54 may have been intended to create a subtle connection between “Ewigkeit” and other words associated with the divine. In m. 2 “himmlisches” is set for the voice alone for more than two beats, and the words “Schöpfer” in m. 33 and “Schöpfung” in m. 36 are also initiated by brief glimpses of that texture.

Example 4.13: “Vallorbe,” M. 232, m. 52, diplomatic transcription

appears frequently in the work and seems appropriate at this point. The nearest pc G is the G in the bass tetrachord of m. 55, so it is possible to conclude the aggregate 21 at that point, although the quarter rest in staff 2 of m. 53 seems to signal the end of the phrase.

After m. 54 it becomes difficult to parse the musical material into aggregates that are convincingly demonstrative of an intentional compositional strategy. The next two aggregates, labeled 22 and 23 in Example 4.12, might be coincidental, and, at the very least, they do not evince the same pattern seen in nearly every earlier aggregate. Instead of a single aggregate that underlays a portion of text, aggregates 22 and 23 show a layered approach in which two aggregates unfold more-or-less simultaneously. The only other example of such an approach was the addition of the bass clarinet figure (aggregate 2) in m. 4 underneath an aggregate (aggregate 1) that was composed previously. Since it was Webern’s modus operandi to compose the vocal line first, it is possible that the aggregates of mm. 54-57 could have emerged in this manner. If the vocal line was composed first, then aggregate 22 was completed by the first note of the instrumental

61Webern’s use of the solo vocal texture in mm. 53-54 may have been intended to create a subtle connection between “Ewigkeit” and other words associated with the divine. In m. 2 “himmlisches” is set for the voice alone for more than two beats, and the words “Schöpfer” in m. 33 and “Schöpfung” in m. 36 are also initiated by brief glimpses of that texture.
figure in m. 56 (b=). In the audible experience of the mm. 54-57 the aggregate created by all parts is resolved by the voice’s g<sup>1</sup> on the downbeat of m. 57, which is simultaneous with d<sup>3</sup> of the instrumental figure.

Aggregate 23 exists as a separate set only in an earlier layer of revisions, as is demonstrated in mm. 56 and 57 of Example 4.12. Before revision this aggregate was complete on beat 2 of m. 57 on the G and f<sup>&#39;</sup> of the fourth staff. The f<sup>2</sup> in the second staff is also necessary to complete the aggregate, but this note is not clear in the manuscript and might be g<sup>2</sup>. Another dubious pitch is the a=1, originally the fifth sixteenth note in m. 56 and the only representative of that pitch class in aggregate 23. This pitch was scratched out and the sixteenth-note figure’s beams extended to include the d<sup>3</sup> that appears to fall on the downbeat of m. 57. The composer probably removed the a=1 to strengthen the resolution of aggregate 22 on the voice’s g<sup>1</sup> in m. 57. The removal of this pc A= delays the completion of aggregate 23 until the G<sup>&#39;</sup> in the bass in m. 58, unless aggregate 23 is interpreted as sharing the pc G<sup>&#39;</sup> with the aggregate of the vocal line. Interestingly, in m. 4-5, the only other section of the work where there are layered aggregates, the pitch that elides aggregate 2 into aggregate 3 is g<sup>&#39;</sup>, and the pitch shared between aggregates 1 and 2 is f<sup>1</sup>. These coincidences, considered along with the obvious rhythmic similarity between the bass clarinet in m. 4 and the instrumental line of m. 56, suggests that Webern may have consulted the beginning of the draft when composing these final measures.

The final phrase of the “Vallorbe” continuity draft, labeled 24 in Example 4.12, encompasses the three-measure instrumental postlude that closes the piece. A diplomatic transcription of these three measures is offered as Example 4.14.  

---

62Example 4.14 maintains each note’s stem direction, beaming and relative position as closely as possible. In Example 4.12 the small sixteenth notes of m. 59 staff 2 have been interpreted as percussion notation, although no instrument is specified. The other four notes of m. 59, staves 3 (a) and 4 (d, c<sup>&#39;</sup> and B=) have no flags, although they are positioned in the measure as eighth notes. Example 4.14 also shows a d<sup>1</sup> (with a downward stem to the right of the notehead) that appears under the beam of the percussion sixteenth notes. The d in staff 4 was probably intended to replace this note.
The letter notation for the final pitch is not completely clear and might be “e.” If the final note is E
denoted as E₁, then it could be played on the lowest open string of a standard double bass. If the final note is C₁ then it would be the lowest pitch on a double bass equipped either with five strings or with the extension and key-operated mechanism described in Hector Berlioz’s instrumentation manual. See Berlioz, *Treatise on Instrumentation*, enlarged and revised by Richard Strauss, trans. Theodore Front (New York: Edwin F. Kalmar, 1948), 97. A double bass capable of reaching C₁ is also called for in “Wiese im Park,” op. 13 no. 1.

Example 4.14: “Vallorbe,” M. 232, mm. 58–60, diplomatic transcription

shows, there are at least two different versions of the last three pitches (m. 60), the
version represented in standard notation and the undoubtedly subsequent version rendered
in letter notation. In m. 60 the first pitch in standard notation is a largish blob that may be
either F or E; the natural sign appears to be in the F space, but in that case both the
antepenultimate and last pitches would be pc F, which seems unlikely. In the final layer
of revisions Webern replaced the last three notes with pcs F< E= and C.63 The exact
octave and rhythm that the composer intended is not specified, but following the contour
and general idea of the earlier version, I have arrived at the solution shown in Example
4.12, F< -E= -C₁ quarter notes. If the reading is correct, then the instrumental postlude of
“Vallorbe” ends with a complete aggregate that plunges to the lowest note of the piece,

63 The letter notation for the final pitch is not completely clear and might be “e.” If the
final note is E₁ then it could be played on the lowest open string of a standard double bass. If the final note is C₁ then it would be the lowest pitch on a double bass equipped either with five strings or with the extension and key-operated mechanism described in Hector Berlioz’s instrumentation manual. See Berlioz, *Treatise on Instrumentation*, enlarged and revised by Richard Strauss, trans. Theodore Front (New York: Edwin F. Kalmar, 1948), 97. A double bass capable of reaching C₁ is also called for in “Wiese im Park,” op. 13 no. 1.
continuing the theme of descent that has been seen in earlier melodic figures and once again representing the dramatic landscape of the Vallorbe region.

Anyone who is familiar with Webern’s loose-leaf sketches, particularly the continuity drafts, will not be surprised to find that the last measures of the “Vallorbe” continuity draft are inconclusive in some regards. Webern labored over the endings of his pieces nearly as much as he did the beginnings, and he often did not reach a definitive version of the last measures until the fair copy stage or even after. That Webern substantially revised the last measures of “Vallorbe” is indicated by the fact that the last three pitches are written after the final barline. If an aggregate had constituted the earliest version of the song’s final measures, then the resolution of that aggregate would have occurred before the final barline and is now erased. Given the combined facts that the final measures of Webern’s continuity drafts were typically very lightly jotted down in the most fleeting manner, that the composer erased and substantially revised these measures, and that, unlike the beginnings of pieces, there are rarely multiple sketches of these final measures to compare, it seems reasonable to deduce that the end of a continuity draft is the portion of a draft that is the least likely to reveal its earliest compositional history.

**Use of Solo-Voice Scoring**

Webern’s final setting of Kraus’s poem is generally sparse in texture, a difference that is particularly striking when compared to opening measures of the fragmentary sketch 101-0582. In contrast, the fourteen-member instrumental ensemble of the continuity draft never plays tutti, and the overall texture is most often characterized by the vocal line moving against a short, often very chromatic countermelody played by a single instrument. Several brief passages are denser and include chordal figures, either in agitated movement (as in mm. 26 and 31) or sustained (as in mm. 17-21), for as many as three or four instruments (see Example 4.9). The predominant texture of the piece, however, is thinly scored polyphony, through which the soprano voice is occasionally heard alone for a brief span. Webern used these short solo passages to emphasize important words, to punctuate formal features of the poem, and simply to clarify text
declamation. The vocal-solo scoring was also used motivically to strengthen connections between related ideas or repeated words in the poem. The importance of the brief vocal solos as a recurring motive is signaled immediately in m. 2 (Example 4.7), where the soprano sings “himmlisches” in the longest solo utterance of the piece. Other words associated with the divine are treated similarly, as in mm. 33 and 36 (Example 4.10), where the first syllables of the words “Schöpfer” (creator) and “Schöpfung” (creation) are declaimed during brief silences in the instrumental parts, thus also emphasizing both the assonance and bilaterally symmetrical structure of the poem’s seventh line. The first syllable of the title word, “Vallorbe,” also emerges as a vocal solo in m. 11 (Example 4.7). In this case the brief solo entrance not only emphasizes the word but also heightens the connection to the clarinet motive of m. 1, where f⁸ was first heard alone and then descended through c⁵ to e⁴. In mm. 17-18 (Example 4.9) Webern accented “Orbe” in a slightly different manner, not by setting the word itself in solo voice, but by so treating the preceding article, “der.” The brief caesura in the relatively dense chordal accompaniment thus provided emphasizes the word “Orbe,” the last word of the first stanza, and makes all the more striking the instrumental ensemble’s shift into the very low register. This also has the effect of making the start of the new aggregate audible. Later in the work other important words, such as the interjection “Ursprung der Zeit!” (origin of time) in mm. 24-25 and “Ewigkeit” (eternity) in mm. 53-54 (Example 4.12), are also set off by more than two beats of silence in the instruments.⁶⁴ The composer also employed the solo voice to punctuate the form of the poem, often featuring this device on the first syllable after a comma: for example in mm. 7 (Example 4.7) and 43 (Example 4.10) on the word “du,” the first word in several lines of the poem, in mm. 16 on “traum[tiefes],” and twice on the word “wie” in mm. 47 and 54 (Example 4.12). In other measures fleeting vocal solos result when instrumental attacks are slightly delayed,

⁶⁴In mm. 24-25 and 54, as with many other measures in the manuscript, there are not enough rests to account for the silence in the instruments, and the solo voice texture could be an indication that these measures are incomplete. Webern often did not bother to write in rests, however, so their absence does not necessarily indicate incompleteness.
Perhaps Webern elected to slur the first two pitches of the clarinet line in mm. 0-1 to emphasize $f^2$ and treat $g^2$ as an upper neighbor tone, allowing the vocal syllable to be heard clearly, as in mm. 4, 29, 41, and 50.

**The Ursprung Motive**

The first few measures of the work also introduce other important motives, as is typical of Webern’s song style, yet in this case the motivic connections do not constitute a tightly woven set of sequential interval relationships, as we have seen in other works. Rather, the motivic connections are more subtle and are related to contour, rhythm, and intervallic relationships between widely spaced pitches. For example, the four-pitch clarinet figure of mm. 0-1 is related not primarily by intervals or pitch classes but by contour and rhythm to the setting of “Ursprung der Orbe” in m. 5 (Example 4.7). These two melodies also share $f^2$ and $c^2$ as the second and third pitches of the figure. The exclamation “Ursprung der Zeit!” in mm. 24-25 (Example 4.9) is also set very similarly, thus adding another level of affinity to two phrases that the poet had already linked through text repetition and positioning within the poem; “Ursprung der Orbe” is the first part of the first stanza’s second line, and “Ursprung der Zeit” occupies the same place in the second stanza. The vocal line of mm. 24-25 harkens back to the original Ursprung motive, as it was first revealed by the clarinet in mm. 0-1, by falling from $f^2$ to $e^1$. The importance of these two notes as the essence of the Ursprung motive was revealed earlier in mm. 11-12 (Example 4.7), where key word “Vallorbe” was set to these same pitches.\(^{65}\) The textural connection between the clarinet line of m. 1 and the setting of “Vallorbe” has already been established. Perhaps Webern chose this simple descending major ninth motive, notable for not being either of the pervasive ic 1 intervals, to symbolize a descent into the valley region to which the poem is dedicated.

The $f^2$-$e^1$ Ursprung motive is also manifest more abstractly as a descending major ninth interval in several other melodic contours, particularly in the early stages of the song. For instance, several vocal phrases and instrumental melodies ascend to a highpoint and then descend to conclude on a pitch a major ninth below. This occurs in

\(^{65}\)Perhaps Webern elected to slur the first two pitches of the clarinet line in mm. 0-1 to emphasize $f^2$ and treat $g^2$ as an upper neighbor tone.
mm. 2-3 (Example 4.7), between d² on “himm[lisches]” and c¹ on the last syllable of “Geflecht.” This is followed by the short major ninth descent in the glockenspiel from b² to a¹. In m. 4 the vocal melody again manifests this abstract connection, descending from f<² to e¹. As was already mentioned, the interconnection of the concepts of Ursprung and the major ninth, particularly between f² and e¹, is explicitly related to “Vallorbe” in mm. 11-12. The vocal melody at the beginning of the second stanza, mm. 19-22 (Example 4.9), is obviously related to the vocal melody in mm. 1-3, for it again rises to d² and shares the unordered pitches b¹ b¹ and c¹, but the major ninth descent to c¹ is not complete until “hier,” the first syllable after the comma between the sixth and seventh syllable. After the previously mentioned f² to e¹ descent in “Ursprung der Zeit,” mm. 24-25, two measures later the harp moves from e to f<², expanding the major ninth interval by an octave, and in m. 32 this expanded interval, here between b² and g<, marks the highest and lowest pitches of the unorchestrated triplet figure. The vocal phrase between mm. 39 and 43 (Example 4.10) begins on e² and then descends twice to the d¹, first on “Gott” and then at the end of the phrase on “Joux.” This phrase also contains a transformation of the Ursprung motive, which here ascends from f¹ to e² on “am Weg.” In m. 46 the vocal line descends from f<² to e¹ on “niebesiegten” in m. 46, but here the e¹ marks neither the end nor the lowest pitch of the phrase.⁶⁶

The Geflecht Motive

In poetic line 1 Webern set the first syllable of “Geflecht” above a shifting orchestration that illustrates the word’s connotation as a tangled or interwoven network, as in basketry, an image amplified by the line’s last word “Glockenblumenkorb” (bellflower basket). In m. 2 of the continuity draft Webern drew two crossed dotted lines, included in Example 4.7, to indicate that at least the middle pair of the four instruments

⁶⁶As discussed previously, the last pitch of the “Vallorbe” continuity draft is designated by a rather ambiguous letter notation that might be either pc C or E. While a final pitch of C¹ nicely concludes the final aggregate phrase in the manner previously described, a final pitch of E¹ concludes the work with an octave and major ninth descent from the antepenultimate pitch F<.
should exchange pitches on the second and third eighth-note triplets of beat 3; i.e., the clarinet should play f^1-g^= while the harp plays g^-f^1. This idea first appeared in preliminary sketch 103-0779, as can be seen in Example 4.8 m. 2. In 103-0779 Webern drew four intersecting lines between staves 2 and 3, indicating that all four instruments should “cross” to a note on the staff either above or below.

In the continuity draft two dotted lines connect only the clarinet and harp pitches. No scoring appears in the earliest 103-0779 version of m. 2 beat 3, shown in Example 4.8 on staves 4 and 5, but the pitches g^= and d^= appear in the tetrachords of both versions in 103-0779 and the continuity draft. These pcs, along with pcs F< and G, also appear in later occurrences of the Geflecht motive, as in mm. 13-14 (Example 4.7), where the voice and bass line exchange pcs G and F<, appearing as G-f< followed by f< -g<. As mentioned earlier, these pitches also elide aggregate 6 with aggregate 7 and the beginning of poetic line 4. Although the motive is not audible in mm. 13-14 as a matter of scoring—i.e., the soprano and bass lines do not actually cross over each other—the exchange of pitches is clearly audible in the sparse two-voice texture. In mm. 16-17 (Example 4.9) the composer made the Geflecht motive more explicit by again scoring the interweaving motion. The instrumental abbreviations in these measures clearly indicate that the violin and trumpet lines cross each other, although they do not exchange pitches as was seen at the first occurrence of the motive. In both m. 2 and m. 16 the pcs F, F< and G< are featured prominently in the Geflecht motive, in m. 2 as three pitches of the tetrachord and in mm. 16-17 as the lowest pitches of the trichords. In mm. 16-17 the clarinet again appears as the middle voice in the chord and ends the phrase on c<2, the fourth pitch of the tetrachord in m. 2. Thus, the first part of the piece, which sets the first

---

67. It may be that Webern intended for both instruments in each staff to cross and play the pitches of the other staff, but in that case the cello would have to play the d=, because it is a half step below the B= clarinet’s lowest pitch.

68. In 103-0779 the final version of the Geflecht figure was written on staves 2 and 3. An apparently earlier version of these chords was written in staves 4 and 5. The sixteenth-note violin figure on beat 1 of m. 2 does not appear at the beginning in the continuity draft, but a very similar figure does occur in m. 37.
Subsequent appearances of a similar motive are not orchestrated and are much less explicit: for example in m. 35 (Example 4.10), where pcs G and E are exchanged as the lowest and highest notes of the trichord (staff 2), and m. 39, where the pitch a (beat 1, staff 2) is followed by A (beat 2, staff 3) and the bass E=1 half note (staff 3) is followed by e=1 in staff 2 and e=2 in the voice.

At the beginning of this unorchestrated measure the pcs D (appearing as d1 and d), D= (d= and c<1) and A= (A= and a=) are passed back and forth between the two staves. Webern then circled nearly everything in the measure and revised it to fall entirely within the bass staff. The resulting figure oscillates by step or half-step between a= -g=, d-c<, and G-A=. A very similar figure of oscillating half-steps occurs again in m. 31 (Example 4.9), where two pitches, d and g, sound repeatedly on alternate sixteenth notes to complete the aggregate of that phrase. In m. 44 (Example 4.10) a similar chromatic oscillation is seen in both the voice and the two instrumental lines, and it appears for the last time on beat 1 of m. 51 in the instruments.

The oscillating chromatic motive of m. 44 provides an example of another curious feature of this piece, namely the inclusion of linear figures that closely parallel the rhythm of the vocal line. If Webern’s setting of “Vallorbe” had reached the fair copy stage, many of these secondary melodic figures might have been labeled as Nebenstimme, although the Hauptstimme and Nebenstimme markings were never carried over into the printed editions. The first instance of such parallel figures is seen in mm. 5-6 (Example 4.7), where the vocal line, moving as quarter notes, is accompanied by an unorchestrated,

---

69 Subsequent appearances of a similar motive are not orchestrated and are much less explicit: for example in m. 35 (Example 4.10), where pcs G< and E are exchanged as the lowest and highest notes of the trichord (staff 2), and m. 39, where the pitch a (beat 1, staff 2) is followed by A (beat 2, staff 3) and the bass E=1 half note (staff 3) is followed by e=1 in staff 2 and e=2 in the voice.

70 If every measure of 103-0777 is counted, regardless of deletion or the number of beats between each barline, then the measures recreated as Example 4.15 are mm. 10-11 of that page. No clef appears in any staff, but comparison of this measure to the next (that latter of which is shown in Example 4.9 as m. 26) indicates that staff 3 of the example is in treble clef and staff 4 in bass clef.
quarter-note, chromatic descent in the second staff. In this instance, the last two pitches of the countermelody, $f^\sharp-g^\natural$, acts as an echo of the voice’s major seventh leap from $c^2$ to $d^\natural$. In mm. 14-15 (Example 4.9) the vocal line and accompanying countermelody are even more strikingly similar, for although they are slightly different rhythmically, both the four-pitch setting “der Thäler du” (e $g^\natural$ e$^\flat$ d$^\natural$) and the underlying four pitches of the countermelody (b d$^\flat$ b$^\flat$ a$^\flat$) move to a parallel interval pattern, thus forming, of course, the same pc set class (4-12). A similar case occurs in m. 38 (Example 4.10), where again both the intervals and the rhythm of the voice are paralleled by the three-note figure of the second staff. The final occurrences of these parallel structures is seen in mm. 48-49, although here both the intervals and the set class of the voice and countermelody differ.

Example 4.15: “Vallorbe, M. 232, mm. 26-27
“Vision des Erblindeten,” M. 236

Context

Webern’s position as Vortragsmeister in Schoenberg’s Verein für musikalische Privataufführungen (Society for Private Musical Performances) consumed much of his time and energy during the inaugural season, which ran from November 1918 to late June 1919. Only in July 1919, during a vacation at Mürzzuschlag, did he once again have the opportunity to resume his creative work.\(^1\) Inspired, as ever, by his pilgrimage to the Styrian Alps, the composer produced a number of new works, beginning with a rapidly sketched but complete setting of Kraus’s poem “Vision des Erblindeten.”\(^2\) The five-page continuity draft of this orchestral song is dated 2 July 1919 after the concluding double bar. Despite the detailed musical conception achieved in the draft, like the continuity draft of Kraus’s “Vallorbe” from the previous summer, no fair copy of “Vision des Erblindeten” was ever created. Rather, Webern turned once again to the poetry of Trakl and quickly produced a series of continuity drafts and fair copies that would later be published as nos. 2, 3, 5 and 6 of the Six Songs, op. 14.\(^3\) This period of extraordinary

\(^1\)Chronicle, 231.

\(^2\)Unlike the other five Kraus poems that Webern set to music, “Vision des Erblindeten” did not first appear in Die Fackel. Rather, the poem was first published in 1918 in volume 3 of Worte in Versen. Furthermore, “Vision des Erblindeten” is not included in Wolfgang Hink’s “Die Fackel”: Herausgeber, Karl Kraus: Bibliographie und Register, which indexes the contents of Kraus’s lectures, despite the fact that Kraus did read the poem along with “Vallorbe,” “Flieder” and other poetry at Vienna’s Harmonium-Saal on 2 June 1920. For the program of this lecture see Die Fackel 546-550 (July 1920): 3.

\(^3\)“Abendland III,” op. 14 no. 4, had been drafted in June 1917. The last song of op. 14 to be composed, “Die Sonne” (op. 14 no. 1), was not composed until August 1921.

In her dissertation Shreffler also tentatively placed two undated sketch fragments on Trakl’s poem “Verklärung” (M. 225, fragments no. 4 and 5) in July 1919, although they may have been created as late as 1921; see “Webern’s Trakl Settings,” 87-88 and 335. In all, Webern created six fragmentary and distinct settings of “Verklärung,” three in 1917 and three more sometime between 1919 and 1921. For a thorough discussion of the “Verklärung” fragments, see Lyric Impulse, 134-44.
productivity was cut short on August 5 when Webern left Mürzzuschlag for Klagenfurt, due to the illness and subsequent death of his father.

Webern’s setting of “Vision des Erblindeten,” M. 236, is a 34-measure\textsuperscript{74} orchestral song for soprano voice and the following thirteen instruments: flute, clarinet, bass clarinet, horn, trumpet, trombone, violin, viola, cello, double bass, celesta, harp, and bass drum.\textsuperscript{75} Although the relatively large ensemble of the “Vision des Erblindeten” draft is comparable to those seen in song sketches of the previous two years—most notably those of “Wiese im Park” and “Vallorbe”—the subsequent sketches and drafts from July 1919 are for much smaller ensembles. The four Trakl songs created that summer, as well as one of the “Verklärung” fragments (M. 225, version no. 4) that also might have originated from this period, all employ a quartet of clarinets and strings.\textsuperscript{76} Shreffler has suggested that Webern’s general trend toward smaller instrumental groups after the composition of “Vision des Erblindeten” might have been influenced by the ensemble forces typically used in Verein performances,\textsuperscript{77} for the Verein often performed pieces in

\textsuperscript{74}Moldenhauer counted the measures as 39, apparently double counting a few measures that exist in multiple, alternate versions; see Chronicle, 277.

\textsuperscript{75}See Chronicle, 277 and 740-41, for Moldenhauer’s description of the “Vision des Erblindeten” manuscripts. Moldenhauer cataloged “Vision des Erblindeten” as the second of a group of three unpublished Kraus songs, which also includes “Vallorbe,” M. 232 and “Flieder,” M. 246. These three songs are similarly grouped in the published catalog of the Paul Sacher Stiftung; see Felix Meyer and Sabine Hänggi-Stampfli, eds., Anton Webern Musikmanuskripte, 19.

\textsuperscript{76}According to Shreffler’s dissertation, a preliminary sketch fragment of “Gesang einer Gefangenen” (op. 14 no. 6 in the final version) from July 1919 calls for a flute, along with bass clarinet and viola, but the subsequent continuity draft and fair copy call for clarinets and strings only; see “Webern’s Trakl Settings,” 334. A sketch fragment (version no. 5) of “Verklärung,” M. 225, that Shreffler tentatively placed in July 1919 calls for an ensemble of nine instruments, including the oboe; see Lyric Impulse, 135. If this “Verklärung” fragment did originate from July 1919, it represents the only use of a double reed instrument that summer.

\textsuperscript{77}Lyric Impulse, 75. Shreffler has also suggested that Webern’s use of smaller ensembles corresponds with an increased emphasis on contrapuntal textures; see “Webern’s Trakl Settings,” 94-96.
reductions for two pianos and other small ensembles. Webern himself had arranged his 
*Passacaglia*, op. 1, for two pianos, six hands the year before, and he arranged his *Five 
Pieces for Orchestra*, op. 10, for violin, viola, cello, harmonium, and piano in the summer 
of 1919. During the following two years Webern continued to compose songs for small 
instrumental groups of two to four instruments,\(^{78}\) with the notable exception of the 
fragmentary sketches on Kraus’s poem “Flieder,” M. 246, three versions of which call for 
an ensemble of nine to twelve instruments. The relatively large and similarly constituted 
chamber ensembles of the “Vision des Erblindeten” and “Flieder” sketches suggest that 
the composer sought to create pieces that were compatible with his two earlier Kraus 
settings, “Vallorbe” and “Wiese im Park.”\(^{79}\)

**Manuscript Description**

The extant compositional materials of “Vision des Erblindeten,” M. 236, 
are preserved in a five-page continuity draft written on three loose-leaf half sheets; in 
musical order pages 1 and 3 comprise the recto and verso sides of a single sheet, and 
pages 2 and 4 comprise the recto and verso sides of another. These two double-sided 
manuscript pages are of the same paper type,\(^{80}\) and the positioning and similarity of the 
torn edges indicates that they are two halves of the same folio. The fifth page of the draft 
is of a different paper type. Like all of Webern’s continuity drafts, the sketches are in 
condensed-score format with the vocal line in the upper staff of each system.

---

\(^{78}\)Two of the three very brief sketch fragments of “Die Heimkehr,” M. 248, from 1920 
call for ensembles of five and seven instruments. All other settings created that year, 
except those of “Flieder,” call for four or fewer instruments. See Shreffler, “Webern’s 
Trakl Settings,” 335-36.

\(^{79}\)The continuity drafts of “Vallorbe” and “Vision des Erblindeten” both employ 
ensembles of thirteen instruments with only minor differences between them. In 1919 the 
most recent version of “Wiese im Park” was the revision draft with an ensemble of fifteen 
instruments, doubling the cello and double bass but otherwise nearly identical to the 
ensembles of the two later Kraus songs.

\(^{80}\)According to the paper manufacturer’s stamp on page 1, the paper type is J. E. & 
Co., No. 5, 18-staff.
The PSS microfilms of the “Vision des Erblindeten” manuscripts are numbered sequentially but not in the musical order, which is as follows: page 1, 103-0782 (1r); page 2, 103-0785 (2r); page 3, 103-0783 (1v); page 4, 103-0784 (2v); and page 5, 103-0781 (3r). The verso of page 5 (3v) is blank.

Example 4.16 includes the PSS microfilm numbers in brackets above the measure that is the first of each manuscript page: for example, [103-0782] above m. 1.

The only other writing medium is the thick red pencil with which the composer wrote the numerals 1 through 5 in the upper left corner of each page, designating the musical order. The following description of each manuscript page will proceed in the musical order. All measure numbers in the following discussion will relate to the edited reconstruction of the “Vision des Erblindeten” continuity draft provided as Example 4.16, unless otherwise stated.

**Page 1: PSS 103-0782**

The first page of the “Vision des Erblindeten” continuity draft is a nine-staff, oblong-format half sheet, which was torn from its bifolio along the right edge and into a half sheet along the bottom. As mentioned, the paper manufacturer’s stamp appears upside down in the upper right margin of the page: J. E. & Co., No. 5, 18-staff. The composer dated the page “Mürzzuschlag Somer 1919” in the right third of the upper margin, probably several years after the draft was created. Page 1 of the draft contains mm. 1-5 of the orchestral song in the upper five-staff system (staves 1-5 of the manuscript). The music of these measures is firmly and confidently notated, and there is no sign of substantial revision, although a few overwritten pitches and accidentals indicate that isolated pitches were changed. There are also subtle rhythmic changes,

---

81 The PSS microfilms of the “Vision des Erblindeten” manuscripts are numbered sequentially but not in the musical order, which is as follows: page 1, 103-0782 (1r); page 2, 103-0785 (2r); page 3, 103-0783 (1v); page 4, 103-0784 (2v); and page 5, 103-0781 (3r). The verso of page 5 (3v) is blank.

82 Example 4.16 includes the PSS microfilm numbers in brackets above the measure that is the first of each manuscript page: for example, [103-0782] above m. 1.

83 For instance, the second note of the two-note viola figure in m. 1 staff 2 was changed from $c^1$ to $d^1$. Prior to this change the two-note descent by the viola combined with the following three-note descent by the cello created a 5-19 CIII set, a sonority that
Example 4.16: “Vision des Erblindeten,” M. 236, continuity draft, page 1

appears many times in later passages. See, for instance, mm. 10, 16-17, and 29 of Example 4.16.
Example 4.16: Continued
Example 4.16: Continued
Example 4.16: Continued

particularly in the vocal line of m. 4, and minor changes of scoring. Expressive markings, including “col legno” for the strings in m. 1, “mit Dampfer” for the trombone and trumpet in mm. 1-2, several dynamics, and the ritardando indication above the clarinet line in m. 5, enhance the detailed conception of the opening measures. One of the few musical elements left ambiguous on page 1 is the precise rhythmic relationship of the instrumental parts in m. 3; additional rests are required to make sense of this measure. The scoring of the block chords in that measure is also missing, although it is possible that Webern intended to score this passage in a manner similar to m. 1, where the clarinet and strings play sixteenth- and thirty-second notes in homorhythm.
Page 1 of the “Vision des Erblindeten” continuity draft also contains a second four-staff system (staves 5-8 of the manuscript) that begins just to the right of the page’s horizontal middle. This system contains one measure of unorchestrated instrumental music preceded by a 3/4 time signature. A thick, dark bracket written above the measure, as well as the clear similarity between this passage and one appearing on page 2 of draft, indicates that the measure was intended to replace three measures of instrumental figures, beginning with those originally written under the vocal line of m. 11. Example 4.16 contains only the revised version. This revision changed little on the first two beats of m. 11, but it eliminated some later figures and telescoped the instrumental interlude between poetic lines 2 and 3 from four beats (two 2/4 measures) down to the single beat on m. 11 beat 3. In m. 11 staff 4 the dotted-quarter-note tetrachord—shown in Example 4.16 in alternate notation—was not included in the page 1 revision of the measure, although the chord was sustained for three and one half beats in the earliest legible version on page 2. Whether this chord should be included to resolve the harmonic motion of the preceding measure is not certain.

Page 2: PSS 103-0785

The second page of the “Vision des Erblindeten” continuity draft is a nine-staff, oblong-format half sheet torn from its bifolio along the left edge and into a half sheet along the bottom. This page contains eleven measures of music, written in two four-staff systems, but the revision described in the preceding paragraph reduced the musical

---

84 The fifth staff of the upper system contains only the bass clarinet part reproduced in mm. 2-3, staff 5 of Example 4.16. The two systems then overlap, and the fifth staff of system 1 becomes the first staff of system 2 and contains the sixteenth-note figures reproduced in m. 11, staff 2.

85 The revised instrumental parts of m. 11 were first written as two 2/4 measures, which would have fit the time signature of the earlier version, but the barline was then scratched out, the rhythms revised, and the 3/4 meter signature written in.

86 The alternate notation in Example 4.16 shows that the vocal line of m. 11 also underwent revision, reordering pcs C and F<.
content to that appearing in mm. 6-14 of Example 4.16. Sketch page 2 is much less confidently notated and musically detailed than page 1, particularly in the second system, and there are no dynamics or other expressive markings and few indications of scoring.\(^{87}\) The condition of the manuscript suggests that Webern’s initial inspiration for the piece carried him halfway through the poem’s first four-line stanza, but the transition between poetic lines 2 and 3 posed significant problems. Erasure, scratchouts, and lightly notated alternate versions of both vocal and instrumental figures abound after m. 11.\(^{88}\) In Example 4.16 alternate notation has been used to represent a few of the legible scratched-out pitches in the vocal line of mm. 13-14 and in the unorchestrated instrumental figure of m. 13 staff 3. Despite the intense and messy revisions in mm. 12-14, the final layer of the music in these measures is clear and easily interpreted.

### Page 3: PSS 103-0783

The third page of the “Vision des Erblindeten” continuity draft, the verso of page 1 (103-0782), is divided into two four-staff systems, containing eight measures of music (mm. 15-22) that set the last word of poetic line 3, “Gluck,” and all of lines 4 and 5. In some regards the general appearance of page 3 is more like that of page 1 than page 2; after the third page’s first measure, which is a very lightly sketched then crossed out setting of the word “Gluck,” the pencil script once again becomes relatively dark for a Webern sketch. The page also features the more thorough scoring and expressive detailing seen in the first five measures. Perhaps page 3 was created at the beginning of a second sitting, after the composer had taken a break and felt more refreshed, whereas page 2 witnessed his fading energies, or perhaps he simply felt more empathy for poetic lines 4 and 5. Page 3 was not as confidently conceived as page 1, however, for every

---

\(^{87}\) There are unpitched text declamation rhythms above “sie befreit von Nacht und Vaterland” in mm. 8-11.

\(^{88}\) There are also numerous small overwrites, some of which appear to be changes of pitch or accidental, but others of which appear to be where Webern only darkly overwrote an earlier, lightly drawn figure without revision.
measure contains substantial revisions, and many figures are quite messy and difficult to interpret. As is often the case, Webern appears to have had the most difficulty at the transition between poetic stanzas, in this case between the end of the first stanza’s last line in m. 17 and the beginning of the second stanza in m. 20. In the last three measures of the second system, mm. 20-22, the vocal line was written one octave lower than intended, due to the encroachment of the block chords in the last two measures of the upper system (mm. 16-17). This octave displacement begins on the last vocal note of m. 20, written as c<\textsuperscript{1} but intended an octave higher. Webern wrote his usual symbol above the staff, the number 8 followed by a short wavy line, to indicate this displacement.\textsuperscript{89}

Page 4: PSS 103-0784

The fourth page of the “Vision des Erblindeten” continuity draft, the verso of page 2 (103-0785), has been damaged by abrasion in the upper left quadrant, nearly rubbing away the red-pencil numeral 4 in that corner, and there are also black smudges and other traces of dirt. This side of this sheet is the only one in the “Vision des Erblindeten” series that exhibits this type and degree of damage, yet it remains intact and legible. The page is divided into two systems of four and three staves, respectively, and contains seven measures of music (mm. 23-29) that provide a setting of the poem’s sixth and seventh lines, at least in the final layer of revisions.\textsuperscript{90}

Page 4 appears to have been the final page of the draft initially, for the vocal line contains enough music to set the poem’s final line, although the text of that line was not written in the manuscript. Example 4.17 provides a diplomatic transcription of the second system of page 4. As Example 4.17 demonstrates, after m. 29 the misalignment

\textsuperscript{89}Both McKenzie and Cerha failed to recognize this octave displacement in their performance scores of the piece and therefore transcribed the vocal line an octave lower than the composer intended in these measures.

\textsuperscript{90}In m. 23 staff 2 the slur or tie attached to the first note probably indicates that this note is an a<\textsuperscript{1} that should be tied to the final a<\textsuperscript{1} in m. 22 staff 3—the last measure of the previous page—even though there is no tie or slur on the earlier note.
The rhythm at the end of the m. 29 viola figure is not clear. The final a\textsuperscript{2} is written as an eighth note, as seen in Example 4.17, but given the imprecise notation of the rhythmic.

Example 4.17: “Vision des Erblindeten,” M. 236, PSS 103-0784, system 2, diplomatic transcription

of the barlines in the system’s upper and lower staves indicates that the vocal line was composed first. Webern then inserted a darkly drawn and roughly S-shaped line (not included in Example 17) between staves 1 and 2, partially encapsulating the final vocal phrase (the pitches b\textsuperscript{3} through c\textsuperscript{4}). He often used similar lines or brackets to indicate that a figure was to be inserted elsewhere, much as he did when he recomposed m. 11 on the draft’s first page. The shape and placement of this curved line, as well as the fact that he neither erased nor scratched out the vocal figure, could suggest that Webern once intended only to move the vocal line one measure later, thereby creating a space for an instrumental interlude, but he then completely recomposed the setting of the poem’s final line on page 5 of the draft. Webern used the space beneath the rejected vocal figure to sketch instrumental music, the first version of which he circled, as shown directly beneath m. 29 in Example 4.17. His second attempt resulted in the viola flourish that has been interpreted in Example 4.16 m. 29 as a brief instrumental interlude between the seventh and eighth poetic lines.\textsuperscript{91}

\textsuperscript{91}The rhythm at the end of the m. 29 viola figure is not clear. The final a\textsuperscript{2} is written as an eighth note, as seen in Example 4.17, but given the imprecise notation of the rhythmic.
Page 5: PSS 103-0781

The final page of the “Vision des Erblindeten” continuity draft is a ten-staff, oblong-format half sheet with torn left and bottom edges. The composer marked the conclusion of the piece with his typically elaborate double bar, followed by the date “2. VII. 1919.” The draft’s final page contains mm. 30-34 of the song in the relatively darkly penciled upper system of five staves (staves 1-5), whereas the lower system of four staves (staves 6-9) contains very lightly drawn preliminary sketches of the same passage. A diplomatic transcription of both systems is provided as Example 4.18. The final page of this draft provides an excellent example of one of Webern’s characteristic sketching practices, namely the creation of lightly drawn exploratory sketches below the actual working system. In Example 4.18 the first two measures of the second system (not numbered, staves 6-10) contain tetrachords in the third staff that are obviously related to the tetrachords directly above in the third staff of the upper system (mm. 30-31). Example 4.19 disentangles the various alternate readings of the final vocal phrase. The first staff of Example 4.19 shows the rejected earliest version of the vocal line, appearing at the end of the draft’s fourth page (see Example 4.17), and staves 2-6 present the subsequent revisions of the vocal line from the fifth page in the most likely order of composition. Similar examples of this layered compositional method have been identified in other of Webern’s Kraus song sketches, although in many cases the evidence was often partially erased. On sketch page 5 of the “Vision des Erblindeten” draft the difference in writing medium between the upper and lower systems is quite conspicuous; the sketches in the second system were so lightly drawn that they easily could have been erased without a trace. Indeed, that was likely the fate of other, still earlier layers that are no longer discernible. Since the piece was completed in the first system, there was no reason for the composer to erase the sketches in system 2, especially since the “Vision des Erblindeten” continuity draft seems to have been quickly and permanently set aside.

---

revision that connects the previous g-f<1-b=1, it is possible that all four pitches should be sixteenth notes.
Example 4.18: “Vision des Erblindeten,” M. 236, sketch page 5, transcription

**Compositional Process**

Unlike the continuity drafts of “Wiese im Park” and “Vallorbe,” the draft of “Vision des Erblindeten” was not preceded by any extant preliminary sketches. It is, of course, possible that related sketch fragments have been lost, but the five-page continuity draft of the song probably encompasses Webern’s only attempt to set the poem. Webern’s complete setting of Kraus’s anti-war poem apparently emerged in only one or two sittings with a fluency that belies the difficulty that had characterized his creative
In her dissertation Shreffler commented on Webern’s “fluency” during the summer of 1919; see “Webern’s Trakl Settings,” 75-76.

Rather than repeatedly sketching variants of the opening measures, as he had done with “Wiese im Park,” “Vallorbe,” and many other earlier songs, page 1 of the “Vision des Erblindeten” draft was cleanly and spaciously notated, expressively detailed, and left free of any evidence of intense revisions. Only the scoring and rhythmic details of the repeated chords in m. 3 staff 4 were left ambiguous. If preliminary sketches were written within or below the staff system of the first page, they have been completely erased. As the sketch progresses, however, revisions become more and more apparent and substantial, and the last three pages bear the signs of considerable reworking. The latter pages of the draft bear evidence of a layered compositional process of lightly sketching, revising, re-sketching and erasing, thereby generating a continuity draft that represents both the preliminary and final versions of the piece and that becomes

---

92In her dissertation Shreffler commented on Webern’s “fluency” during the summer of 1919; see “Webern’s Trakl Settings,” 75-76.

Example 4.19: “Vision des Erblindeten,” M. 236, alternate settings of final line
The continuity draft of “Gesang einer gefangenen Amsel,” op. 14 no. 6, was preceded by eight earlier and fragmentary versions of the song, the last of which dates from July 1919 and is the only fragment that is significantly similar to the continuity draft; the seven earlier fragments are distinct musical conceptions. Shreffler provides a thorough discussion of these sketches in Lyric Impulse, 197-218.

Further revisions of the op. 14 songs, mostly changes of dynamics and articulations, took place when clean fair copies were created for the first performance in July 1924; see Shreffler, Lyric Impulse, 80.

In her dissertation Shreffler commented, “All three of these drafts are detailed enough to be published and performed” in reference to the continuity drafts of “Vallorbe,” “Vision des Erblindeten” and “Nächtliches Bild,” M. 233; see “Webern’s Trakl Settings,” 75.

McKenzie’s score includes dynamics, orchestration, and other details that are missing or ambiguous in the original manuscripts. In a personal correspondence to this author from January 1997, McKenzie described his realization of “Vision des Erblindeten” as follows:

93 The continuity draft of “Gesang einer gefangenen Amsel,” op. 14 no. 6, was preceded by eight earlier and fragmentary versions of the song, the last of which dates from July 1919 and is the only fragment that is significantly similar to the continuity draft; the seven earlier fragments are distinct musical conceptions. Shreffler provides a thorough discussion of these sketches in Lyric Impulse, 197-218.

94 Further revisions of the op. 14 songs, mostly changes of dynamics and articulations, took place when clean fair copies were created for the first performance in July 1924; see Shreffler, Lyric Impulse, 80.

95 In her dissertation Shreffler commented, “All three of these drafts are detailed enough to be published and performed” in reference to the continuity drafts of “Vallorbe,” “Vision des Erblindeten” and “Nächtliches Bild,” M. 233; see “Webern’s Trakl Settings,” 75.
opinion, however, this continuity draft is too incomplete to allow the creation of a score that could be considered definitive or authentic. Many details of scoring, dynamics, tempo markings, and other performance details, as well as the Hauptstimme and Nebenstimme markings often included in Webern’s continuity drafts, are missing from the “Vision des Erblindeten” manuscripts. In several passages some pitches remain uncertain, often because it is difficult to determine the order and priority among two or more layers of revision, and it is not entirely clear how the recomposed instrumental passages in mm. 11 and 29 should be inserted into the surrounding music. Webern obviously would have known his own intentions, and many of the alternative versions probably represent options among which the composer would have chosen while creating a fair copy. It is also well known that Webern continued to revise the details of his works even after the fair copy stage, and in some cases even engraver’s copies show changes, as is the case for “Wiese im Park,” op. 13 no. 1. Even if there was a fair copy of “Vision des Erblindeten” that was far more complete and detailed, it could not be assumed to contain a piece that had passed Webern’s publication criteria. I do not intend to suggest that it is in any way disreputable to create performance editions of Webern’s unpublished continuity drafts. To the contrary, I believe that critical editions of the unpublished continuity drafts and the even more incomplete fragmentary sketches should be published, and that creative performances of these pieces could be of both scholarly and artistic interest. It is imperative, however, to acknowledge the inherent limitations of any such editions.

---

I do not consider this score a representation of what Webern would have done if he had completed the work on the song. It is an attempt to make a version of the song that uses the information Webern left on the manuscript pages and extrapolates from that enough details to make the score. It provides provisional information about the nature of the song. The McKenzie score is unpublished, but the PSS has a photocopy. Cerha’s scores of “Vision des Erblindeten” and “Vallorbe” were performed, along with several other Webern works, in Vienna on 15 December 1994 and again on 16 August 1997.
**Analysis**

Webern’s orchestral song setting of Kraus’s anti-war poem begins with a relatively expansive instrumental introduction of nearly six beats, colorfully orchestrated for clarinet, bass clarinet, trumpet, horn and a complete family of string soloists. The viola’s opening two-note melodic gesture provides the first occurrence of an important motivic cell, the descending major seventh. There are, of course, numerous ic 1 relationships throughout the piece, but the major seventh interval is of particular importance in both linear and vertical figures occurring throughout the work. The beaming and stem directions used by Webern to notate the agitated tetrachords in m. 1 (see Example 4.16) separate these chords into major-third dyads in parallel and chromatic motion, except for the violin’s thirty-second note escape tone d^1. This d^1 fleetingly doubles the d^1 of the viola and breaks the pattern of interlocking major sevenths that is the predominant sonic quality of these chords: G< g and c-b in the first and last chords, which are repeated; A-g< in the second; and A-g< and c#-c^1 in the third. The odd c< -d^1 minor ninth in the second tetrachord of m. 1 is immediately picked up the trombone at the end of m. 1 staff 4, f to f<, but then the figure descends through b= to complete the major seventh to g, just as the cello in m. 2 staff 2 presents yet another major seventh descent from e< to e. This e is then, in turn, immediately followed by the entrance of the bass clarinet on E= a major ninth below. The first appearance of pcs E= and E in the cello in m. 2 completes the first aggregate of the piece, and the f-f< -b= eighth notes that begin the trombone line in mm. 1-2 staff 4 also constitute the first appearance of those pcs. The end of the trombone line, however, occurs on g in m. 2, constituting the fourth appearance of this particular pitch class, which sounded three times in the clarinet in m. 1. The aggregate structure of the instrumental introduction in “Vision des Erblindeten” is not nearly as clear or demonstrably intentional as that of many other sketches, particularly the draft of “Vallorbe” from the previous summer, but, as will be demonstrated in the discussion below, later aggregate formations within “Vision des Erblindeten” suggest that this is one compositional method that Webern employed in isolated sections of the work.
In mm. 3-4 a pattern of repeated block chords, first modeled by the initial tetrachord of m. 1, is expanded, perhaps pictorially suggestive of gun fire or some other machination of war. The figure certainly expresses aggressive action or violence. The quickly repeated instrumental tetrachords also further develop the pattern of major sevenths, here between the lowest and highest pitches in each chord, although once again the second tetrachord interrupts this pattern with the minor ninth c< -d\textsuperscript{1}. The second tetrachord is also the only one in m. 3 staff 4 that is not constructed octatonically. As Example 4.20 shows, the d-f-a=-d=\textsuperscript{1} chord, heard six times in this measure, and the b-d-f-b= chord, heard twice, are both 4-18 CI sets. The downbeat of m. 3 is, in fact, strongly octatonic, for the tetrachord can be combined with the horn’s G (staff 3) and the bass clarinet’s b=\textsuperscript{1} (staff 5) to form a 6-49 CI set. The second octatonic tetrachord (b-d-f-b=) can be combined with the bass clarinet’s e\textsuperscript{1} to form a 5-16 CI set. Both of these octatonic chords recur later in the work, as does the non-octatonic 4-8 pc set in beat 1 of m. 4 staff 4. The linear horn and bass clarinet figures in this passage are not octatonic, and the vocal line that begins at the end of m. 3 is very chromatic. Like the aggregate strategy mentioned in the previous paragraph, the consistent and systematic use of octatonic collections does not appear to have been Webern’s primary compositional method in the “Vision des Erblindeten” draft, yet later occurrences of chordal passages similar to that in mm. 3-4 frequently contain octatonic sonorities.

As the vocalist gasps through the continuing pattern of sporadic rests that even interrupts the syllables of “Mutter” in m. 4,\textsuperscript{97} the instruments weave a contrapuntal texture of closely related linear figures. The three-note violin line of m. 4 staff 2 groups the pitches d\textsuperscript{1}-c<\textsuperscript{2}-c\textsuperscript{1} in much the same manner as the viola and clarinet lines did in m. 1 (in m. 1 the viola moves from c<\textsuperscript{2} to d\textsuperscript{1}, then the clarinet doubles the d\textsuperscript{1} and moves to c\textsuperscript{1}), and in m. 5 the clarinet groups the pcs A-E=-B=, which appeared together in the tetrachord in the first beat of m. 4. Furthermore, the five-note melodic figure comprised of the viola

\textsuperscript{97}Of course, the first and last rests in the vocal line in m. 4 and the rest in m. 5 all correspond to punctuation in the text, but the rest that separates the syllables of “Mutter” surely must have been inserted for dramatic effect.
Example 4.20: “Vision des Erblindeten,” M. 236, continuity draft, mm. 1-8, select pitch sets

and cello melodies of mm. 1-2 staff 2 and the five-note clarinet figure in mm. 4-5 staff 3 both constitute 5-5 pc sets that share pc A and the pitch e in the antepenultimate and penultimate positions, respectively. In m. 6 the touch of the mother’s hand (“Sofühl’ ich
deine Hand”) temporarily soothes the wounded soldier and puts an end to the gasping rests that hobbled the first half of the vocal figure, while the trombone (staff 3) plays a four-note melody that groups the pcs F and F<, much as it did earlier in mm. 1-2 staff 4.

The vocal settings of the first and second poetic lines and the cello melody of mm. 5-7 also bear a rather obscure relationship. The first seven notes of vocal line 1, setting “So, Mutter, Dank! So fühl’ ich . . .” in mm. 3-6, and the first six pitches of vocal line 2, setting “Oh, sie befreit von Nacht . . .” in mm. 7-10, are both manifestations of the very chromatic 6-Z36 pc set.98 Another 6-Z36 pc set can formed if the five-pitch cello countermelody of mm. 5-6 staff 4 is combined with the c-f linear dyad in m. 7 staff 3. This expanded cello figure (pcs C E= E F G= G in normal order) and vocal line 1 share the pcs E and F and also the notes g¹ and g=¹ as adjacent pitches.99 Furthermore, Webern drew a dotted line in the manuscript that connects the cello’s e= in m. 6 staff 4 to the c-f linear dyad in m. 7 staff 3. The dotted line could have been intended simply to designate instrumentation, but there is no crowding or other reason that the c-f dyad could not have been written in the same staff as the rest of the cello figure, if that was the intended scoring; i.e., m. 7 staff 4 is blank. Of course, Webern may have first given the c-f dyad to the trombone and then simply changed his mind.

Example 4.21 continues the analysis of the “Vision des Erblindeten” draft. In mm. 8-11 the chordal figures in the instruments return, again without orchestration, although in this phrase the chords lack the rhythmic agitation of those in m. 3. The chords in mm. 8-10 are also structured differently than those of mm. 1 and 3, and only the middle chord of m. 10 is wholly octatonic. The first of the two consecutive 5-30 pc sets in mm. 8-9 (in normal order, in m. 8, pcs E= E G A B, and in m. 9, pcs B= C D F F<)

---

98In normal order, the 6-Z36 set that opens text line 1 comprises pcs E F F< G A= B and that of text line 2 comprises pcs G A= A B= B D.

99The 6-Z36 set in the vocal line of mm. 7-10 is not shown in any example. Pitch class G appears twice in the cello line, both as g¹ (as in vocal line 1) and as g. It is perhaps not coincidental that Webern chose the same chromatic spelling for g=¹ in both vocal line 1 and the cello figure. Incidentally, the cello figure of m. 5 staff 4 also contains a very prominent descending major seventh between g=¹ and g.
Example 4.21: “Vision des Erblindeten,” M. 236, continuity draft, mm. 8-11, select pitch class sets

Example 4.21 does contain a 4-Z15 CIII set (pcs E= E G A in normal order; not shown in Example 4.21) as its lower tetrachord. Two of the pcs in this 4-Z15 set (E= and A) were set together in the tetrachord on beat 1 of m. 4, and immediately thereafter all four pcs occurred in close proximity in mm. 4-5 in the clarinet (g-a-e=) and cello lines (e-g).

Similarly, in m. 10 the pentachord that sounds at the beginning and end of the measure, a non-octatonic 5-Z18 (not shown), contains a 4-18 CI set (C< E G A= in normal order) as its lowest tetrachord. This 4-18 CI chord is a transposition of the octatonic chord that sounded six times in m. 3, and the two share the pitch a= and the pc C< (d=1 in m. 3 and C< in m. 10). The chord that falls between these 4-18 CI sets is also octatonic, a 5-19 CII set, and in fact all of the pitches with upward stems in m. 10 staff 4 also belong to that same octatonic collection. In this measure, the dissonant peak of the phrase, two chords from two octatonic collections are superimposed on one another, just as the vocalist enunciates “Nacht und.” Then, as the vocalist sings “Vaterland” on the downbeat of m. 11, concluding the phrase, the chordal dissonance of m. 10 staff 4 is resolved to a yet
another 4-18 CI set. As mentioned in the previous discussion of sketch pages 1 and 2, the 4-18 CI chord on the downbeat of m. 11 was not included in the revision of m. 11 that the composer sketched on page 1 of the draft, therefore the chord is rendered in alternate notation in Examples 4.16 and 4.21.

The completion of another aggregate might have provided the underlying structure of the instrumental interlude in m. 11, between the second and third lines of the poem. According to the interpretation of the revisions provided as Example 4.16, the instrumental interlude in m. 11 contains every pc except G, which sounds on the otherwise silent downbeat of m. 12. The unorchestrated quarter-note triplet figure on the first two beats of m. 11 staves 3 and 4 concludes with a descending major seventh, and the following quintuplet, also in staff 3, is a transposition of the 5-Z36 pc sets that first appeared in the second half of m. 3. These previous 5-Z36 sets are labeled and designated by brackets in m. 3 of Example 4.20.

During the first two measures setting the poem’s third line, mm. 12-13, the octatonic disposition of the instrumental chords seems rather clear, whereas once again the melodic figures contradict such an analysis (see Example 4.22). The first two trichords in m. 12 staff 4 combine to form a 6-Z13 CI set, and the trichord tied over the barline into m. 13 combined with the following two trichords in the same staff and measure supply a complete manifestation of octatonic collection III (8-28 CIII set). (This 8-28 CIII set includes the f<sup>1</sup> in staff 3 to which the composer drew a connecting arrow but does not include the d<sup>1</sup> passing tone at the end of the measure.) In the final layer of revision, none of the linear figures in this phrase is convincingly octatonic, but the five-note figure circled for deletion in m. 13 staff 3 (in alternate notation in Examples 4.16 and 4.22) is drawn from yet another octatonic collection and forms a 4-3 CII set that doubles b<sup>1</sup> (not shown in Example 4.22), just as the revised figure in staff 2 doubles pc A. After this point in the manuscript the multiple scratchouts and layers of revision in m. 14—the final measure of sketch page 2 (103-0785)—are very messy and difficult to interpret; this measure, in fact, seems incompletely conceived. What is evident among the layers of revision, much of which is illegible, does not appear to be fundamentally octatonic. The
Example 4.22: “Vision des Erblindeten,” M. 236, continuity draft, mm. 12-17, select pitch class sets

phrase concludes on the downbeat of m. 15 with another, simultaneous 5-30 pc set (pcs $A \ B \ D= \ E \ F$ in normal order), the same set class that appeared twice in mm. 8-9, but aside from the pc F in the bass of the second chord in m. 9 and that on the downbeat of m. 15, there are no other structural relationships between these chords, and the relationship may be coincidental.
In the last line of the first stanza, “Wie führst du mich in deinen Schoß zurück” (mm. 15-17), the poetic persona, the wounded soldier, uses the second person pronouns “du” and “deinen” to address the mother-image directly, much as he did in the poem’s first line. Perhaps for this reason Webern created clearly audible textural and harmonic connections between the setting of the first poetic line, particularly mm. 3-4, and the setting of the fourth line in mm. 15-17. In the fourth poetic phrase the vocal melody moves above short, repeated, block chords that are very similar to those that were first heard in m. 3-4. As in the first manifestation of these agitated chordal figures, the six pairs of repeated pentachords are grouped within a triplet rhythm, rests are interspersed between each pair, and octatonic sonorities are predominant. Also like the first occurrence of this important motive, the first and last pentachords of m. 16 are drawn from octatonic collection I. The two CI chords in m. 16 are two different transpositions of the 5-19 CI pc set, and the first of these shares pcs C\textless-G\textless and the pitch d with the recurring 4-18 CI chord of m. 3. The second pentachord of m. 16 is also octatonic, a 5-16 CIII set, that could be combined with the e\textsuperscript{2} in staff 2 and the vocal line’s g\textsuperscript{1} to form a 7-31 CIII set. The first 5-16 sets of the piece also occurred in m. 3, formed in that measure by the combination of the 4-18 CI sets with the notes of the bass clarinet line, as was discussed previously. One of several chordal possibilities that Webern entertained at the end of m. 17 was also octatonic, forming a yet another 5-19 set, this one from CIII. After trying several possibilities, he ultimately wrote a 3-3 CII set (pcs D F F\textless) in the bottom staff. The last six pitches of the vocal line—every pitch after the rest in m. 16 beat 2—are also drawn from CII and form a 5-16 CII set, a transposition of the pc set formed by the second pentachord of m. 16 staff 4. The non-octatonic sonorities in mm. 16-17, the two pentachords that fall on beat 3 of m. 16 and on beat 1 of m. 17, are both 5-

---

\textsuperscript{100}A 5-19 CII set occurred earlier in the middle of m. 10.

\textsuperscript{101}This reading (5-19 CIII set) combines the F\#-c-a in staff 4, indicated by the “fis-c-a” in the margin, with the c\#\textsuperscript{1}-g\textsuperscript{1} of staff 3. The final version of the lower trichord was also indicated in the manuscript by letter notation (“fis d f’”), which has not been included in the examples.
6 sets that share the pitches G and g< and the pcs E=- and E. The second of these two non-octatonic pentachords (m. 17 staff 4) is also linked to the tetrachord in m. 8, for both contain the pcs E=-E-G-A, a 4-Z15 CI3 set (not labeled in Example 4.22). Between the vocal melody and the chordal accompaniment, the composer originally composed a four-note countermelody, broken by short rests, in the second staff. The resulting texture of two melodies above repeated and rhythmically displaced extended chords is clearly similar to the music of mm. 3-4. At some point he changed the second note of the unorchestrated countermelody from c< to e< and scratched out the b< and e< on beat 3. The scratched out notes are shown in Examples 4.16 and 4.22 in alternate notation.

After the last repeated pentachord at the end of m. 17, there is a very brief silence on the downbeat of m. 18, yet the rhythmic momentum continues and reaches its peak in this measure (see Example 4.23). Although the harp was the only instrument identified in the first three measures of sketch page 3, Webern carefully scored mm. 18-21 and included many expressive markings. In m. 18 the harp plays the low, disjunct melody in staff 4 while also providing rapid-fire sixteenth and thirty-second notes in parallel major-seventh motion with the pizzicato cello (staff 2). Trills were added to the notes played by the double bass (mm. 18-19 staff 3), and the dynamics included in m. 19 (shown only in Example 4.16)—mezzoforte followed by a crescendo in staff 2, a sforzando major seventh in staff 3, and fortissimo from the harp in staff 4—mark this measure as the dynamic highpoint of the piece. Only the flute maintains the loud dynamic (forte below staff 3) as the vocalist enters in m. 20 and sings the first line of the second stanza, “Nun ist der Donner dieser Nacht verrollt” (“Now the thunder of this night has rolled away”). After the rhythmic and dynamic outburst of the preceding two-measure instrumental interlude, the text verifies the interpretation of the repetitious chordal figures (mm. 3-4 and 16-18) as menacing, the thunder of night and war.

102 Measure 17 is at the end of system 1 and m. 18 at the beginning of system 2 on sketch page 3.

103 Interestingly, the two lines that contain the word “Nacht,” line 2 and line 5, contain the highest incidences of ic 1 intervals, and in both cases the word “Nacht” is approached
Example 4.23: “Vision des Erblindeten,” M. 236, continuity draft, mm. 18-27, select pitch class sets

instruments drop away, and the musical texture becomes very thin, so that the phrase ends in two-voice counterpoint, the thunder spent.

by an upward major third interval (g₁-b₁ in m. 10 and c₂-e₂ in m. 22)
The five-beat instrumental interlude in mm. 18-20 once again exhibits an aggregate-oriented construction. Beginning after the rests on the downbeat of m. 18, mm. 18-19 provide every pitch class except pc F, which is provided by the harp on the otherwise silent downbeat of m. 20. An earlier occurrence of the pitch F at the end of m. 18 staff 3 was circled and replaced by B, perhaps to delay the premature resolution of this aggregate. Alternatively, an octatonic reading of a portion of the instrumental interlude is also possible. As in previous octatonic readings of isolated sections of this piece, such an interpretation cannot conveniently account for all of the pitches in this musical subsection. It does, however, account for every pitch in staff 2 of mm. 18-19, which collectively constitute a 7-31 CIII set that is missing only pc B= from the complete collection (see Example 4.23). Pitch class B= appears twice in the third staff of m. 19, once on the otherwise silent first beat. This octatonic connection is probably coincidental, for the linear figure in m. 19 staff 2 is actually derived from the collection of pcs E= E G A, the same 4-Z15 set that appeared in the lower tetrachord on the downbeat of m. 17 and earlier in the lower tetrachord of m. 8.

In the setting of poetic line 6, “Ich weiß es nicht, was sie von mir gewollt” (“I do not know what they wanted from me”), the despair of the poetic persona is illustrated once again by the rests that fragment the vocal declamation. Despite the similar rhythmic interruption caused by the rests in m. 24 staff 3, the chordal accompaniment (again unorchestrated) moving beneath the vocal setting is relatively sustained and sedate, recalling the similar chords that accompanied line 2 (Example 4.21 mm. 8-11). Even though the tetrachords in mm. 23-26 are more simply constructed than the pentachords of the earlier phrase, the sonorities in both passages are far less octatonic than nearly every other chordal passage. Only one of the chords that accompany poetic line 6 is octatonic, the 4-3 CIII pc set on beat 2 of m. 23, most noteworthy because it shares four pcs (E= E F< G) with the linear figure in m. 19 staff 2. Webern may have drawn the textural connection between poetic lines 2 and 6 simply to highlight the structure of the poem, but perhaps he intended to indicate that the “sie,” the intentions of whom the soldier does not understand, is the “Nacht” of line 2. The harmonic motion of mm. 24-25 is largely
restricted to a changing pattern of 4-7 sets with a single 4-8 set tied across the barline. These 4-7 sets are transpositions of the 4-7 set that was expressed as the first tetrachord of m. 1, and the 4-8 set shares the pitches d, g< and c< with the three 4-18 sets of m. 3 staff 3.

After the initial “O” that starts the penultimate line of the poem (m. 26), the two-note setting of the first syllable of “Mutter”—a rare instance in which the composer did not use a strictly syllabic text setting—is emphasized by a brief silence in the instruments. Once again, after several measures with no instrumental abbreviations, the composer was specific regarding the scoring at the beginning of this phrase. The first syllable of “Morgen” (m. 28) is also set to multiple pitches (see Example 4.24). The four-note figure that sets “Morgen” contains the same pcs that form the 4-7 set at the end of m. 25 staff 3 (Example 4.23), although every pitch is displaced by one or more octaves. The thinly textured phrase in mm. 26-30 provides another possible example of Webern using an aggregate as the basis of a musical subsection. After the e1 at the end of the previous phrase (m. 26 staff 3), the delayed arrival of which is emphasized by the ritardando written above the upper staff, there are no more pc E in this phrase until the celesta e1 on the downbeat of m. 30. Pitch class E was deleted from the phrase at least twice earlier, however—once on the downbeat of m. 28 and again on the word “thaut” in m. 29,—bolstering the interpretation of the aggregate formation as intentional. These revisions are indicated using alternate notation in Examples 4.16 and 4.24. The examples also show that pc E was once used to set the first syllable, “Schon,” of the final poetic line, beginning on m. 30. In the final layer of revisions, the interlude in m. 29, which presents every pc but E once again (the viola solo actually presents every pc except E, all by itself), extends the resolution of the aggregate until the downbeat of m. 30. The three linear tetrachords of this viola figure are also quite octatonic and related to earlier motives. The first four pitches of the m. 29 viola figure (b1-e2-c2-a1) form a 4-12 CII set, and the last four pitches (g-f<1-b=1-a3) form a 4-3 CIII set.104 The middle four pitches

104 A 4-3 CIII set containing the pcs C< and G occurred earlier in m. 23.
Example 4.24: “Vision des Erblindeten,” M. 236, continuity draft, mm. 28-34, select pitch class sets

(c<1-a= -f-d), a 4-18 CI set, are the most interesting and the most derivative from earlier material. The linear 4-18 CI set of m. 29 shares all four pitches with the tetrachord that was heard six times in m. 3 (Example 4.20), and other prominent 4-18 CI sets occurred in mm. 10-11 staff 4 (Example 4.21). If the 4-18 CI set in the middle of m. 29 is expanded to include the following g, the linear pentachord formed is a 5-19 CI set that shares pcs C< G< and the pitches d and g with the 5-19 CI set heard at the beginning and end of m. 16 staff 4 (see Example 4.22).

Three of the four pcs that form the previously mentioned 5-19 CI set in m. 29 (G< C< F) appear again immediately in the 4-17 CI set that is repeated three times by the celesta under the first four words of the final vocal line, “Schon bin ich da” (“I am already
The lowest note on a bass clarinet is E = a major ninth below the cello’s E, whereas in m. 31 the bass clarinet enters on E a major seventh below the e = 1 in the bottom of the 4-8 chord in staff 3. The two bass clarinet countermelodies also share a general contour and the final rhythmic grouping of descending quartet-note triplets. The movement of this bass clarinet line underneath the pulsing chords of the celesta is clearly reminiscent of the passage in mm. 2-3. Although displaced by octaves and rhythmically dissimilar, the bass clarinet line of mm. 31-32 also shares the first three pcs of the cello figure in m. 5, which begins just before the phrase “So fühle’ ich deine Hand.”
Another rather obscure, certainly inaudible, but apparently intentional relationship exists between the setting of “Gottes Auge blaut” in mm. 32-34 and the earlier setting of “fühl’ ich deine Hand” in mm. 6-7. Although the contour and rhythms of the two vocal lines are different, they share the same interval class sequence: 2 4 1 2. Although the melodies are positioned quite differently in octave space, the sequence of pcs in the latter line is one semitone lower: the last five pitches in poetic line 1 are f<1 e<1 c<1 b<1 c<1, whereas the last five pitches in line 8 are f e<2 b<1 b= c2. Both are the same set class, of course: a 5-14 set. If the pc B (b on “So” in m. 5 and b on “Wo” in m. 31) that introduces each of these six-syllable phrases (separated from the first half of their respective phrases by a comma in both cases) are included, the pc set remains the same, since pc B appears twice in both phrases. This relationship can hardly be coincidental. Here Webern seems to have purposefully equated the phrase “So fühle ich deine Hand” and “Wo Gottes Auge blaut,” connecting the hand of the mother to the sacred image and color. The slight downward transposition applied to the later vocal line might also reinforce the interpretation of the soldier descending into death.

“In tiefster Schuld vor einem Augenpaar,” M. 210

The compositional materials for Webern’s settings of Kraus’s “In tiefster Schuld vor einem Augenpaar,” cataloged in the composer’s Nachlaß as M. 210, are found in two one-page pencil sketches. Both sketches are fragmentary, and each provides a setting of only the first of the poem’s two four-line stanzas. The Moldenhauers described only one of the sketches, 103-0760, and they were unable to identify the poem’s origin.106 The second sketch, 103-0763, was discovered by Shreffler, who also identified the poet.107

---

106Moldenhauer, Chronicle, 277; this sketch is listed in Appendix 1C, pp. 738-39, with an unknown author. See also note 109 below.

107Lyric Impulse, 60 n. 53. The poem first appeared under the title “Widmung des Werkes” in Die Fackel 317-18 (28 February 1911): 33. It appeared in the first volume of
The M. 210 manuscript described by the Moldenhauers was not dated by the composer, so the Works List in Chronicle provides only the approximate date “1914 or later.” The sketch discovered by Shreffler is written on the first side (page 1r) of an intact bifolio that also contains a pencil sketch of the song “Christkindlein trägt die Sündern der Welt,” M. 245, on side 4 (page 2v; 103-0762). The sketch of M. 245 is dated 1920 in the composer’s hand, and the “In tiefster Schuld” sketches almost certainly date from approximately this time. “In tiefster Schuld” sketch 103-0763 was written on the bifolio right-side-up, as can be determined by the upright orientation of the paper manufacturer’s stamp in the lower left corners of sides 1 and 3 (pages 1r and 2r); the inner sides of the bifolio are blank, and “Christkindlein trägt” appears upside-down on page 2v. The relative orientation of “Christkindlein trägt” suggests that this sketch was created after the sketch of “In tiefster Schuld” and that Webern already may have abandoned his attempts to set “In tiefster Schuld” by that point. Otherwise, it is difficult to explain why he left “In tiefster Schuld” incomplete and reused the bifolio for another song sketch. Shreffler lists 103-0760 before 103-0763 in Appendix 2 of her dissertation, a chronological list of “Webern’s Compositions and Fragments 1915-1921,” and this does seem the most likely order, although we cannot verify the chronology with certainty.

**PSS 103-0760**

The first sketch of “In tiefster Schuld” is a single-page, fragmentary, pencil sketch, comprising approximately nine measures of music for soprano voice, clarinet, and piano.

---

108 This piece, the author of which was unknown for many years, was identified by Shin’ichiro Okabe as a passage from Goethe’s Sprichwörtlich; see “The Webern Sketches 1914 to 1935: A New Chronology Based on a Comprehensive Survey,” 122. Inexplicably, the Moldenhauers described the sketch of “Christkindlein trägt” (Chronicle, 277 and 740-1) but did not describe the second sketch of “In tiefster Schuld” (103-0763) contained in the same manuscript.

109 “Webern’s Trakl Settings,” 335.
violin, and harmonium, contained in two systems of five and four staves, respectively.\textsuperscript{110} The sketch was written on an 11-stave, oblong format half-sheet, torn from its bifolio along the right edge and into a half-sheet across the top. There is a paper manufacturer’s stamp on the sheet’s verso: J. E. & Co., No. 7, 22-staff. Although the manuscript is obviously a sketch, containing many circled deletions and revisions, it is not in short-score format. Rather, contrary to Webern’s typical sketching procedure, the voice and each of the three instruments were written on their own staves, and the instrumental parts were given abbreviated labels in the left margin. This full-score arrangement reveals that in this instance the composer projected the ensemble from the beginning of the sketch, rather than spontaneously calling for and then revising the instrumentation as he composed, as was his usual sketching method. It is therefore possible that 103-0760 was preceded by another sketch that is no longer extant or that the composer wanted to match the ensemble of “In tiefster Schuld” with that of other works already created. The sketch begins confidently and includes several dynamic markings (ppp and crescendo/decrescendo symbols) and a “mit Dämpfer” indication (abbreviated as “m. D.”) in the violin part. After four beats of instrumental introduction for the clarinet and harmonium the voice enters at the end of m. 1. Only the first line of the poem is written in the manuscript, although it is simple to reconstruct the syllabic text setting. The clarinet part, clearly the most important line after the voice, is well developed through m.

\textsuperscript{110}Webern left one blank staff at the top of the page and another between the two systems. In mm. 2 and 3 the violin part, written on the fourth staff (from the top), is circled, and the revision is written in the otherwise blank uppermost staff, creating what is in effect a six-stave system at the top of the page. The composer ran out of room in m. 4, so he extended the staves into the right margin in pencil and completed the measure.

The verso of 103-0760 contains a seven-measure sketch of “Die Heimkehr” (103-0759), cataloged by Moldenhauer as M. 248 and listed as no. 7 of the unpublished Eight Trakl Songs. The 103-0759 sketch is one of two on this poem. This sketch is in short-score format with multiple abbreviated instrumental indications. The instruments called for are flute, clarinet, trombone, glockenspiel, celesta, cello, and double bass. See \textit{Chronicle}, 276, 738-39. Shreffler briefly mentions the sketches of “Die Heimkehr” in \textit{Lyric Impulse}, 74, 133, 150. According to Shreffler the poem was first published in \textit{Der Brenner}, 5 (1915): 10; see \textit{Lyric Impulse}, 28.
4. The violin part was subjected to extensive recomposition in m. 2, and both it and the harmonium part are incomplete in m. 4. The sketch degenerates to only the vocal line and a bass line in m. 5 (the latter in the bass clef of the harmonium part) and to the vocal line alone in mm. 6-9.

**Analysis: PSS 103-0760**

Example 4.25 provides a transcription of the final layer of revisions in all nine measures of manuscript 103-0760.\(^\text{111}\) The sketch begins with the solo clarinet playing a quintuplet that contains basic motives that will be developed in the following measures. The gesture obviously is related by both rhythm and contour to the similar clarinet gesture in m. 4 beat 2. Both quintuplets begin with a descending major seventh (f\(^1\) to g\(^=\) in m. 0 and c\(<\)\(^1\) to d after the sixteenth rest in m. 4); the quintuplet of m. 4 also ends with an ascending major seventh between e\(^1\) and e\(^=\)\(^2\), followed by yet another between e\(^=\)\(^2\) and d\(^3\).

There are numerous other linear occurrences of the major seventh, for instance in m. 1 between the clarinet’s d\(^3\) and e\(^=\)\(^1\), in mm. 2-3 between the violin’s a\(^1\) and a\(^=\)\(^2\), which is followed immediately by another between a\(^=\)\(^2\) and g\(^3\), and in m. 5 between the harmonium’s A and a\(^=\). Other important occurrences of this interval will be considered as this discussion proceeds.

After the descending major seventh that begins the piece, the second interval in the clarinet is an ascending major third between g\(^=\) and b\(^=\), followed by a major sixth from b\(^=\) to g\(^1\), the latter of which appears again in the same gesture between c\(^2\) and a\(^\flat\). The intervals of a major third and a major sixth are also prominent within the sketch, both of them frequently appearing in the guise of their interval class equivalents of the minor sixth (ic 4) and the minor third (ic 3), respectively. An example is seen between the end of m. 1 and the downbeat of m. 2, where ic 3 appears both in the voice as a minor third, g\(^1\)

\(^{111}\)The partial (one beat) measure at the beginning of this sketch will be referred to as m. 0 in the discussion to follow. As mentioned previously, the interpretation of the violin and harmonium parts in m. 4 is dubious and by necessity incomplete. Most of the text was not written in the manuscript, and therefore all text after m. 3 is in brackets.
Example 4.25: “In tiefster Schuld,” M. 210, PSS 103-0760, final layer

to b=¹, and in the clarinet as a major sixth, f² to a=¹. The perfect fourth and perfect fifth that occur in the clarinet introduction between g¹ and c² and between a² and d², respectively, also occur later in the sketch with some frequency—for example, in m. 2 between the voice’s f¹ and c¹ and the violin’s e=² and b=²—although they are of less importance than the other featured intervals. The major ninth and ic 1 intervals, particularly in the form of the major seventh and the minor ninth, first introduced in m. 1, are also formative intervals in the introductory measures. On m. 1 beat 2 the clarinet’s e=¹ is accompanied by a tetrachord in the harmonium, forming a pentachord that contains an octave and major seventh interval between the bass E and the clarinet’s e=¹, as well as a minor ninth between B= and b>. The clarinet’s f² on beat 3 is a minor ninth plus two octaves from the bass E of the preceding harmonium tetrachord. This clarinet pitch is also a major ninth above the previous e=¹ in the same instrument, constituting the first linear appearance of this interval in the sketch. Earlier there were two subliminal major
ninths between non-consecutive pitches in the m. 0 clarinet introduction, namely b= to c\textsuperscript{2} and g\textsuperscript{1} to a\textsuperscript{2}. The minor ninth is first presented subliminally between g= - g\textsuperscript{1} of m. 0. The connection between b= and c\textsuperscript{1} is made explicit in m. 3, where these pitches are heard adjacently, again in the clarinet. The major ninth appears again in m. 2 when the vocal line drops from f\textsuperscript{<2} to e\textsuperscript{1} on “[tief]ster Schuld,” illustrating the “deepest debt.”

As in the pentachord played by the harmonium and clarinet in m. 1, the major seventh and minor ninth intervals predominate in all of the block chords sounded by the harmonium in this sketch. The harmonium chord of m. 2 comprises interlocking major seventh and minor ninth intervals between G-f\textsuperscript{<} and B-c\textsuperscript{1}, respectively. In an earlier layer of revisions a tetrachord in the harmonium’s bass clef on beat 3 of m. 2 (see Example 4.26) contained both a major seventh and minor ninth above a bass E= along with a major seventh between d and c\textsuperscript{<1}, but the composer ultimately negated this chord with a circle. All three dyads in the harmonium in m. 3 are major sevenths. Other major sevenths and minor ninths occur in the harmonium chords of m.4, in addition to the major thirds, perfect fourths, and perfect fifths seen previously. Although the intervallic structure of the music in 103-0760 is derived from the pitch relationships presented by the instrumental introduction, the resulting harmonic palette is rich with possibilities. The sparsity of linear movement by major and minor seconds is a conspicuous characteristic. While there is considerable linear movement in the sketch, these chromatic intervals are almost invariably offset by an octave.

The instrumental introduction not only presages the interval content of the ensuing music, it also shares pc groupings with the succeeding instrumental and vocal figures. For instance, the clarinet riffs of mm. 0-1 and 4 share the linear grouping of the unordered

---

\textsuperscript{112}This descending major ninth is the largest vocal interval in the final layer of the sketch, but the vocal line may have contained a leap from b to e\textsuperscript{=2} on “schuf, was” in m. 4 beat 3.

\textsuperscript{113}The second dyad in the harmonium’s treble clef in m. 3 is very lightly and tentatively drawn and perhaps should be disregarded with regard to ascertaining a final layer of revisions.
It is also interesting that in both quintuplet figures the first, second, and fourth pcs form an ascending chromatic trichord \((f^1-g^1-c^2)\) in m. 0; \((c^2-d^1-e^2)\) in m. 4). The initial quintuplet also groups the pitches \(b^1-g^1-c^2\), which are seen again reordered in the same instrument and octaves at the end of m. 3 and the downbeat of m. 4. The pitch material of the vocal line in mm. 1-2 was also drawn from the introductory clarinet quintuplet; in fact, the first six pcs of the vocal line contain all five pcs of the clarinet quintuplet, separated only by the \(e^1\) on the syllable “Schuld.”

The distribution of pitches in 103-0760 reveals that part of Webern’s compositional strategy was the delineation of musical sections through the presentation of complete chromatic aggregates, a process I have come to call “aggregate phrasing.” As in several other pieces in this study, the first aggregate is completed at the end of the instrumental introduction, when the clarinet resolves its introductory gesture to \(a^1\) on the downbeat of m. 2. The clarinet line in mm. 0-2 combined with the accompanying harmonium tetrachord forms an aggregate that doubles only pcs \(F\) and \(B^1\). A similar approach continues in the setting of the first line of text in mm. 1-3, where two complete aggregates are presented. The diplomatic transcription of mm. 1-3 offered as Example 4.26 and the graphic set analysis of the same measures offered as Example 4.27 will assist in the following discussion.

Nearly everything in the violin and harmonium in m. 2, except the harmonium tetrachord on the downbeat, was eventually circled for deletion by the composer. Early in the composition of mm. 1-3 the composer sought to present two aggregates that are differentiated between the parts into two 8-8 sets and their complements. The first line of the poem is set to eight pitches that form one version of...

---

\(^{114}\)It is also interesting that in both quintuplet figures the first, second, and fourth pcs form an ascending chromatic trichord \((f^1-g^1-c^2)\) in m. 0; \((c^2-d^1-e^2)\) in m. 4), if octave equivalence is assumed.

\(^{115}\)Example 4.26 closely reproduces the stem directions, beaming and, most importantly, relative positions of all the musical material present in the manuscript. Example 4.26 also does not include a large irregularly shaped circle that Webern drew to cancel everything in the violin part in m. 2. (The instrument names in the right margin and the clefs are not, of course, in m. 1 in the manuscript but have been inserted for the convenience of the reader, as have the measure numbers.)
Example 4.26: “In tiefster Schuld,” M. 210, PSS 103-0760, diplomatic transcription, mm. 1-3

the nearly chromatic 8-8 pc set (pcs E = E F F< G B= B C in normal form), labeled “8-8 set I” in Example 4.27.\textsuperscript{116} It seems that the composer was well aware of the pitch content of the vocal line as a set, because the sketch’s earliest legible layer also features a nine-note, eight-pitch violin figure that presents another 8-8 set (pcs C< D E= E F G< A B=), labeled in Example 4.27 as “8-8 set II.” This violin figure contains the 4-8 complement of the vocal line (pcs G< A C< D, labeled as “4-8 set I”) as a linear tetrachord, voiced as a\textsuperscript{2} c<\textsuperscript{2} g<\textsuperscript{1} d\textsuperscript{1} in the second half of m. 2.\textsuperscript{117} The 4-8 complement (4-8 set II) of the violin figure (pcs F< G B C) is presented as a vertical tetrachord by the harmonium on the downbeat of m. 2, voiced as G B f< c\textsuperscript{1}. While it is possible that these sets resulted solely from repetitive use of the limited palette of intervals that underlie the sketch, the resulting interaction of complementary eight- and four-note sets must be more than coincidental.

\textsuperscript{116}Example 4.27 is concerned only with the first phrase and does not include the clarinet’s notes in m. 1 or on the downbeat of m. 2 (all part of the earlier aggregate), the final violin line as seen in Example 4.25, nor any of the music after the rests in m. 3.

\textsuperscript{117}Measure 2 has three beats, but the transcription of staff 3 in this measure (violin part) looks as if it has at least four beats, due to the inclusion of all legible layers of revision.
Example 4.27: “In tiefster Schuld,” M. 210, PSS 103-0760, 8-8 and 4-8 sets, mm. 1-3, early layer

The sequence of revisions in the manuscript suggests that the composer gradually arrived at this hypothetical compositional scheme during the process of composing. For example, the eight-pitch violin figure in m. 2 was not written all at once but is the product of revision and the combination of at least two different layers. Differences in writing medium (the earlier layers are lighter) suggest that the initial e⁴ e⁴ b³ were written over previous material, which is no longer legible, whereas the following six notes (e³ through d¹) are part of the earliest layer. This explains why the e³ is directly underneath the e¹ of the voice, creating an octave and major seventh, but it does not explain the odd placement of the following four sixteenth notes. This order of revision means that Webern did not first circle the b³ and then write in the e³, but rather the whole nine-note figure was “active” on the page and in the composer’s mind at the same time, despite
the fact that it does not fit into the 3/4 meter. Realizing the metric discrepancy, Webern circled the $b=^3$, creating a linear minor ninth between $e^4$ and $e=^3$. After a brief excursion into the right hand of the harmonium, the pc $B=^3$ eventually wound up as the fourth note in the violin figure (as shown in Example 4.25), rhythmically placed just before the voice’s $f^1$, for reasons that will be discussed below.

At some point the composer also circled the final $d^1$ of the earliest m. 2 violin figure and wrote the high $g^3$ and $b^2$ above it, but it is difficult to reconstruct the sequence of this and subsequent revisions.\(^{118}\) The basic process was one of dismantling the 8-8 set II of the violin line and redisposing these pcs throughout the texture, so that two aggregates, segmented into two different 8-8 sets and their complements, are presented during the phrase. Webern sketched several solutions to this problem in m. 2. For instance, the triplet in the harmonium’s treble staff ($b=^2 \ a^1 \ a=^2$, another instance of minor ninth and major seventh intervals, respectively) are pcs from the violin’s 8-8 set II, which were ultimately returned to the violin, spread throughout mm. 2 and 3 in the final version. In the resulting version, shown in Example 4.28 with the set analysis superimposed, all of 8-8 set I and five pcs of 8-8 set II are presented linearly in the voice and violin, respectively. The complement of 8-8 set II (4-8 set II) is still in the harmonium on the downbeat of m. 2, where it was from the beginning, and two pitches of the complement to 8-8 set I are presented by the clarinet at the end of m. 2 and the downbeat of m. 3. The sixth pc of 8-8 set II ($f^1$) is provided by the harmonium on the downbeat of m. 3 as the upper member of a major seventh dyad. Finally, the D-c< dyad in the left hand of the harmonium provides the last two pitches of the 8-8 set I complement (4-8 set I), while also completing 8-8 set II. Of course, this analysis does not account for every pitch that remains in the final version, particularly the clarinet’s $a-b^1$ in m. 2 and the harmonium’s $f<$ on the downbeat of m. 3. However, the linear presentation of the 8-8 sets in the earliest legible layer of the sketch, the harmonium’s clear presentation of 4-8 set II in m. 2

\(^{118}\)One more sequential step in the revision process can be ascertained; the crowding of the clarinet’s $g<^3$ on the last pitch of m. 2 indicates that it was written after the high $g^3$-$b^2$ of the violin.
Example 4.28: “In tiefster Schuld,” M. 210, PSS 103-0760, 8-8 and 4-8 sets, mm. 1-3

as a constant element throughout the revisions, and the fact that both aggregates are completed cleverly by a single dyad at the cadence in m. 3 argue strongly in favor of the preceding analysis.\textsuperscript{119}

After the first phrase it becomes increasingly difficult to determine what pitches are intended to be “in” or “out” of any given layer, and the segmentation of the pitches into 8-8 sets or any other discernible pattern almost completely breaks down. Measure 4, especially in the violin and harmonium, gives the impression of a proliferation of preliminary ideas that have not been edited. Also, the exact repetition of the triplet figure in the harmonium on m. 4 beat 3 and m. 5 beat 1 (see Example 4.25), and the appearance of a three-note chord in the violin stave of m. 4 (not included in any example),\textsuperscript{120} suggest

\textsuperscript{119}The f\textsuperscript{-}, f\textsuperscript{5} dyad in m. 3 in the harmonium’s treble clef, also not accounted for in the set analysis of mm. 1-3, is very lightly and indistinctly drawn in the manuscript and may be part of an earlier layer.

\textsuperscript{120}The notes of this chord, which are indistinctly formed but appear to be f-b-e\textsuperscript{5}, do not all fall within the range of the violin.
that this measure is even more “sketchy” than the profusion of ideas encountered in mm. 2-3. One oddity worthy of remark remains, however, in mm. 5-6, a transcription of which was provided as Example 4.25. In m. 5 of the manuscript Webern drew a downward slanted line, not shown in the example, that, if extended, would pass between the c^1 and b^1 of beat 2 in the voice and would intersect the g^1 two staves below, presumably in the treble clef staff of the harmonium. The pc set that includes the vocal pitches of m. 4, the first three vocal pitches of m. 5, and, following the slanted line, the last four notes of the harmonium is a twelve-note figure that doubles pcs G and B^\#\, triples pc C, and is yet another manifestation of 8-8 set I seen in the voice in mm. 1-3. Despite the high incidence of pc repetition in this amalgamation, the set is not complete until the final E^\# of the bass line. Again, whether this is a coincidence of the numerous ic 1 intervals seen in the work or evidence of an organizational scheme is difficult to determine. If this slanted line constitutes a memory aid that Webern left for himself, then it points to a compositional procedure that might have been completely obscured had the sketch reached a more advanced stage.

One of the most striking characteristics of this short fragment is the high incidence of immediate pitch repetition in the first five measures of the vocal line, presented in its entirety in Example 4.29. Following his typical working procedure, Webern first developed this motive in the vocal line in m. 2, where f^1 is repeated on the syllables “vor ei[nem],” and m. 3, where e^2 is repeated on “[Au]gen-paar.” There is

---

Example 4.29 contains only those accidentals that are present in the manuscript. The three notes in alternate notation in mm. 2-4 are notes that Webern wrote and then deleted by circling or scratching out. The pitch on the first syllable of “geschaffen” (mm. 5-6) is illegible in the manuscript, although there is a squiggle that covers an area from b^1 to e^2.

The second e^2 in the vocal line of m. 4 has no accidental in the original manuscript, providing another example of Webern’s not writing in an accidental when a pitch is immediately repeated. My interpretation is supported by the repetition of c^[1-2] in m. 4, where neither of the notes has an accidental in the original manuscript. In a case similar to that of m. 3, in m. 2 the accidental on the second f^[1-2] is assumed, whereas in m. 4-5, where the repeated b[^1] occurs across the barline, he wrote in both accidentals.
believe these examples illustrate Webern’s general tendency, although he was inconsistent.

123 Given Webern’s background in Renaissance musical scholarship, he would have been aware of the tradition of setting textual references to eyes, usually the Italian term “occhi,” to repeated semibreves, formed as hollow ovals, on the same pitch.
last instance of pitch repetition occurs in the vocal line on the syllables “was es,” although this time the second pc B is displaced an octave downward, preparing the upward leap of a major seventh that was the penultimate interval at the end of lines 1 and 2. Linear pitch repetition, although an important feature of the vocal line, is heard only once in the instrumental lines, in m. 2 where the violin’s entrance is marked by the rapid repetition of $e^4$. The repeated $e^4$ is a common element in both versions of the violin line still legible in the manuscript. There are also two pc Bs an octave apart, voiced as B and b, in the harmonium’s bass staff at the beginning of m. 4; perhaps this dyad can be regarded as a vertical manifestation of the originally linear “[Au]genpaar” motive, since it is rather unusual for Webern to double a pitch in this manner. These notes are also a minor ninth (displaced three and two octaves) from the simultaneous c$^2$ of the vocal line.

Webern emphasized the rhyme scheme of the first couplet by creating a musical “rhyme,” comprised of $f^4$ c$^1$ b$^1$ and pc E= (e$^{-2}$ in m. 3 and e$^{-1}$ in m. 6), that links “einem Augenpaar” with “[da]rin immer war.” This musical rhyme can be extended to include pc B=, which the composer carefully placed as the violin’s b$^2$ just before $f^4$ on the syllable “vor” in m. 2 (see Example 4.25), and which is repeated in m. 5 on the syllable “da[rin]” as b$^1$ before the soprano’s $f^4$. The last two intervals that form these two cadences, a major seventh followed by a major third or its interval class equivalent (ic 4), were first modeled in the first three notes of the clarinet’s quintuplet in m. 0. This succession of intervals also links the first two cadences to those in m. 7. Although the

---

124 The accidental on the voice’s b$^1$ in m. 7 is a little ambiguous and the note may be b$^1$. If so, then the antepenultimate and penultimate intervals of that phrase are sequential major sevenths.

125 The sixteenth rest that begins the violin’s figure in m. 2 perhaps influenced the similar placement of the rest before the clarinet’s quintuplet in m. 4.

126 Measure 2 of Example 4.26 shows that an e$^{-2}$ appeared in the violin figure of the earliest layer just before the $f^4$ of the voice; likewise, m. 4 of Example 4.30 shows that an e$^{-2}$ (in alternate notation) was originally used to set the syllable “was,” obviously before Webern incorporated the repetitive “[Au]genpaar” motive into the sketch. Apparently, the parallel structure of the first two lines was to be musically accentuated in earlier layers of the sketch, as well.
last three pitches at the end of the third line (m. 7) are different from those of lines 1 and 2, the last two intervals are the same—a major seventh up, b to b♭1, followed by a major third down, b♭1 to f<1. A similar pattern in the vocal cadence in m. 9 is conjectural, because the penultimate pitch is nearly illegible and the last pitch does not appear at all. The difficulty began in m. 8, where the vocal line runs off the staff and into the right margin on the word “es” of “Himmel hilft es.” Since the note for “es” is not on the staff, the composer wrote “d” in the margin to clarify. He then sketched at least three notes at the end of the staff two staves below. I have assumed that these three pitches, in an otherwise nearly empty staff, are also part of the vocal line, since Webern’s song sketches usually end at a major division in the poem. This interpretation sets the first syllable of “Hölle” (hell) on the lowest note of the vocal melody, which is entirely plausible. Like the d♭ on “es,” the note on the second syllable of “Hölle” is nearly illegible and off the staff in the right margin, but the placement of its accidental suggests an a♭. The duration of this a♭ is unclear, although Webern wrote a 3 above it, indicating a triplet figure of some kind. The major seventh created by setting “Hölle” on b♭=a♭ is consistent with the penultimate interval at the vocal cadences in mm. 2-3, 5, and 7, which further suggests that the final pitch, on “heiße,” could be f♭ or c<2, supplying the major third also appearing at the earlier cadences. Concluding the vocal phrase on f♭ would create an exact interval rhyme with m. 7 one half step lower, whereas concluding the phrase on c<2 would create an exact interval rhyme with m. 3 one whole step lower. No final pitch appears in the manuscript, however. Webern would have known his own intention, of course, and certainly would have been able to recall it even at a much later time, especially if he intended to create an intervallic analogy to the rhyme scheme of the last two lines. He is known to have used this technique in other works, including the second sketch of “In tiefster Schuld.”

127 The only other note in this staff is the isolated g♭ included in m. 5 of Example 4.25.

128 Shreffler has discussed how Webern “analogizes intervallic repetition with verbal rhyme” in sketches on Trakl’s poem “Verklärung”; see Lyric Impulse, 141-42.
PSS 103-0763

The second sketch of “In tiefster Schuld,” the final layer of which is reproduced in Example 4.30, is a single-page, fragmentary sketch that contains slightly more than twelve measures of music for soprano voice and piano, written as a vocal staff above a grand staff.\textsuperscript{129} The sharp pencil writing in this manuscript is very small and light, even by the standard of a typical Webern sketch. The 103-0763 version of “In tiefster Schuld” is markedly less developed than that found in 103-0760. The sketch features neither dynamic nor expressive markings, except for the pedal indication in m. 1, and some measures are very indistinctly formed, such as the piano part in m. 6. The piano’s left-hand in that measure contains moving notes, possibly eighths or sixteenths, but is indecipherable and therefore omitted entirely from Example 4.30. The right-hand part in m. 6, although clearer, is tentatively notated and may also be incomplete. The manuscript contains numerous overwrites, particularly of accidentals, and many of the accidentals are sloppily formed in general, making it difficult or impossible to differentiate between naturals and sharps. For these reasons, several of the measures in Example 4.30 are reliably representative of the texture and rhythm of the music but are dubious with regard to specific pitches. Not all of the text appears in the manuscript, but again the text-setting is syllabic, and, as in 103-0760, there is enough music to set the entire first stanza of the poem. Unlike most of Webern’s abandoned sketches, which end with a lone vocal line that has outpaced the accompaniment, this sketch ends with a three-note descending figure in the piano. Also contrary to his usual practice, this sketch appears on the first side (page 1r) of an intact bifolio, rather than on one of the half- or quarter-sheets that Webern usually used for preliminary sketches. The bifolio is comprised of 16-stave, vertical format sheets. There are paper manufacturer’s stamps on sides 1 and 3 (pages 1r and 2r): J. E. & Co., No. 4, 16-staff.

\textsuperscript{129}The notes in alternate notation in mm. 3-4, 9 and 13 were deleted (circled or scratched out) by the composer and replaced by the other notes shown with standard noteheads. This transcription does not preserve the original spacing or stem directions. Only those rests and accidentals that were written in the manuscript are included.
It is unclear what Webern intended in the bass of m. 3—i.e., whether or not he intended for the measure to contain both the three-note chord and the three quarter notes that follow. The attack count of 28 includes all six notes.

As mentioned previously in note 130, the rests in Example 4.30 correspond to those in the manuscript, so Webern obviously intended these notes to sound alone.

Example 4.30: “In tiefster Schuld,” M. 210, PSS 103-0763, final layer

Analysis: PSS 103-0763

The 103-0763 version of “In tiefster Schuld” is generally much sparser in texture than 103-0760. With far less instrumental counter-melody than is seen in 103-0760, the 103-0763 version appears much more homophonic; the vocal line of 103-0763, composed of longer note values, unfolds over a relatively slow-moving accompaniment. During the first four measures, which set the first line of text in both versions, there are only approximately 28 separate attacks in 103-0763, as opposed to 45 or more in 103-0760, and sometimes a single pitch is heard in silence, as in the voice’s d on the downbeat of m. 2 (the manuscript does not indicate when the piano’s pedal is to be released) and the piano’s f in m. 5. In some measures, particularly mm. 4, 8-9, and 11-12, the voice

---

130 It is unclear what Webern intended in the bass of m. 3—i.e., whether or not he intended for the measure to contain both the three-note chord and the three quarter notes that follow. The attack count of 28 includes all six notes.

131 As mentioned previously in note 130, the rests in Example 4.30 correspond to those in the manuscript, so Webern obviously intended these notes to sound alone.
moves against colorful, block chords, some of which invite a recognizably triadic, though never harmonically functional, interpretation. For example, the piano accompaniment of m. 4 is clearly a C<₆ chord, above which Webern originally wrote a melody (b=₁ e=² e₁, seen in Example 4.30 in alternate notation) that, although written enharmonically in flats instead of sharps, corresponded nicely with C< harmonic minor and completed the phrase by doubling the bass note at the octave. The revision of the vocal melody includes the tritone on the downbeat and loosens the tonal implications, as may have been the composer’s intention. Another triadic chord occurs on the downbeat of m. 9, where the five pitches could be construed to constitute a D⁹ chord with the 9th, pc E, in the bass. In an early, but still legible, version of the vocal line, the syllable “zu” was set on d², supporting a D-major reading of the measure. Webern then wrote an isolated c⁵ in the otherwise empty staff line above (this staff line is not shown in Example 4.30), directly above the d², with the clear intention of changing the pitch on “zu.” That revision and the e=¹ on “tun” further obscure the triadic sonority. The inverted D⁹ chord is preceded in m. 8 by an even less definitively triadic C< sonority in which the doubled C< in the bass makes it difficult not to hear the accompaniment as a half-diminished C<⁹ chord. Of course, this reading suggests a pc D>, and unfortunately, the accidental on the d¹ in the piano’s right hand is not at all clear. To me it looks more like a sharp than a natural. Other open fifths and second-inversion triads appear in the sketch (see the bass in mm. 11-12), but probably most unexpected is the brief A-major (or minor) chord at the cadence at the end of the poem’s first stanza, formed in m. 12 when the F<₆ quarter notes in the piano drop out and leave only the c<² (c>²?) in the voice with open fifth half-notes in the bass. Of course, the absence of rests on beats 1 and 2 of the piano’s right hand, as well as the fact this measure is at the end of an abandoned sketch, suggests that the

---

132 In the manuscript a dot following the c² in the piano has been crossed out and the d² quarter note added, indicating that the inverted C<⁷ chord originally sounded throughout the measure.

133 Here is yet another example of an absent accidental when two adjacent notes appear on the same line or space. The possibilities offered here are discussed below.
measure is incomplete. No matter how Webern may have conceived these conventionally triadic chords, they are not approached or resolved in a functional manner, and I believe that they were not intended to imply tonality but rather as manifestations of the tightly woven intervalllic structure that is the foundation of this sketch.

The truncated quintuplet piano figure (m. 1) that introduces this version of “In tiefster Schuld,” and that is rhythmically reminiscent of the clarinet introduction in the 103-0760 version as well, presents a compressed motive from which much of the subsequent musical material is derived. Although the figure’s descending interval pattern of perfect fourth, minor sixth, minor third is found later in the work (a perfect fourth transposition of this figure in m. 11 will be discussed below), the introductory quintuplet is even more important as two interlocking intervals, a minor ninth (e\(^\text{m\text{-2}}\) to d\(^1\)) and a major seventh (b\(^{=\text{-1}}\) to b). These intervals are ubiquitous and are often presented in an interlocking or simultaneous manner in both the voice and piano in the measures that follow. For instance, immediately after the piano introduction, the voice enters a minor ninth above the piano’s last pitch (b to c\(^2\)) and then descends a major seventh to set the first syllable of “tiefster,” again illustrating “deepest” with a large leap downward.\(^{134}\) Whereas the voice in 103-0760 descends a major ninth to “Schuld” to illustrate the “tiefster Schuld” (“deepest debt”), in 103-0763 the voice leaps up a major seventh from “[tief]ster” to “Schuld” (f\(^1\) to c\(^2\)) while the piano leaps simultaneously a minor ninth up from b\(^{=\text{-1}}\) to b\(^2\).\(^{135}\) Other linear and interlocking expressions of these intervals are seen in m. 5, where the voice leaps up a major seventh (c\(^1\) to b\(^1\)) on “ich schuf” while the piano leaps down a minor ninth from f\(^5\) to e\(^1\), and m. 6, where the voice performs a transposition (major third) of the intervals seen in the last three pitches of the opening figure (down a

\(^{134}\)The interval between the second and third vocal syllables (“tief-ster”) is a major third, the same interval class (ic 4) as the distance between the second and third notes of the piano’s quintuplet (expressed as a minor sixth). Also, the piano’s a\(^1\) in m. 2 (preceded by a rest) is ic 4 above the preceding d\(^=\text{-1}\) in the voice.

\(^{135}\)In the manuscript there is a circled (deleted) b in the piano (a major seventh below the previous b\(^{=\text{-1}}\)) on the downbeat of m. 3, as well.
Although, as previously mentioned, no definitive transcription of m. 6 is possible, the pitches and rhythms provided in Example 4.30 are those that are clearest in the manuscript. The only pitch in this measure of Example 4.30 that is uncertain is the a\textsuperscript{1} on beat 1.\textsuperscript{136}

The intervals of major seventh and minor ninth are presented not only linearly in 103-0763, but they also appear vertically. For example, in m. 3 the tetrachord in the piano comprises two interlocking major sevenths, A=g and c/c\textsuperscript{1}-b\textsuperscript{2}, although the latter dyad is displaced by one and two octaves. On the downbeat of m. 3 the e\textsuperscript{2} in the voice does not share this relationship with any pitch in the accompaniment, but is, as observed earlier, a major seventh above the f\textsuperscript{4} that precedes it. In contrast, on the downbeat of m. 4 the vocal line’s g\textsuperscript{1} is a major seventh above the g< in the piano, and the c<\textsuperscript{1} and c\textsuperscript{2} also share this relationship. Perhaps coincidentally, pc E, this time in the bass, is again the odd pitch. In the earlier version of the vocal line (shown in Example 4.30 in alternate notation) the vocal pitch on “[Augen]paar,” e\textsuperscript{1}, which is the end of the poem’s first line, doubles the bass e at the octave. Interestingly, the pentachord formed on the downbeat by the b=\textsuperscript{1} of the deleted vocal line and the piano’s tetrachord is a 5-26 pc set, the same set that occurs on the downbeat of m. 8;\textsuperscript{137} the two pentachords also share pc C< and the pitch b=\textsuperscript{1}. Naturally, as an instance of the same pc set, the pentachord in m. 8 also contains the ic 1 (major seventh) between b and b=\textsuperscript{1}. The earlier version of m. 9, which placed “zu” on d\textsuperscript{2}, again presents the formative intervals both horizontally and vertically, as the vocal line sets “[geschaf]-fen kund zu tun” on f\textsuperscript{4} f<\textsuperscript{2} d\textsuperscript{2} e=\textsuperscript{1} (minor ninth, major third, major seventh) against the major sevenths in m. 8 and 9 (c<-d\textsuperscript{1}).

\textsuperscript{136}Although, as previously mentioned, no definitive transcription of m. 6 is possible, the pitches and rhythms provided in Example 4.30 are those that are clearest in the manuscript. The only pitch in this measure of Example 4.30 that is uncertain is the a\textsuperscript{1} on beat 1.

\textsuperscript{137}This reading of m. 8 depends on a d<\textsuperscript{1} in the piano’s right hand. If the ambiguous pitch is d>\textsuperscript{1}, then the pentad features the major ninth (c<-d\textsuperscript{1}) as well as an octave and a ninth (C<-d\textsuperscript{1}). Furthermore, the < on the c< in m. 8 is an overwrite. Although the original accidental is illegible, it was almost certainly a >, which would have created a major seventh between the two bass notes and another between c and b.
From several perspectives, m. 11 constitutes the climax of the 103-0763 version of “In tiefster Schuld.” Here, on the first syllable of “Himmel” (Heaven) the vocalist reaches her highest note, g<sup>2</sup>, and then descends in a straightforward perfect fourth transposition of the four-note pattern from m. 1. The eighth-note rest (the first of a triplet figure) that follows these four notes corresponds both grammatically with the comma in the text after “es” and motivically with the rest that is the last sixteenth-note of the m. 1 quintuplet. The interlocking minor ninth and major seventh intervals that characterize this linear figure are accompanied by similar interlocking intervals in the accompaniment. The lower four pitches of the pentachord include a minor ninth, B<sup>1</sup>-c, and a major seventh, F<sup>&lt;</sup>-f, and the top note of the pentachord supplies the link between the horizontal and vertical dimensions, creating an octave and major seventh interval between a and the g<sup>2</sup> of the vocal line. At the climax of the first stanza, “Himmel hilft es,” every pitch is related to the interlocking pattern of intervals established at the beginning, illustrating the perfection of heaven or perhaps “creating what was always there,” as stated in the poem’s second line (“worin ich schuf, was darin immer war”).

Although m. 11 is the musical highpoint of the fragmentary work, it is not, of course, the end of the poetic stanza or sketch. After m. 11 the vocal line proceeds to the final more-or-less complete measure with a minor ninth descent into hell, e<sup>=</sup><sup>2</sup> to d<sup>1</sup> between “der” and the first syllable of “Hölle,” creating on the downbeat a hexachord that contains two minor ninths, each of which is displaced by an octave (A<sup>1</sup>-a<sup>&lt;</sup> and c<sup>&lt;</sup>-d<sup>1</sup>). The vocal line then makes a major seventh ascent to c<sup>&lt;</sup> on the second syllable “Hölle.” In the manuscript there is no accidental before the second c<sup>2</sup> on “heiß,” and it is not clear what Webern may have intended here. The immediate repeat of c<sup>&gt;</sup><sup>2</sup> in the accompaniment on the last beat on m. 12 might argue for a c<sup>&lt;</sup><sup>2</sup> on “heiß,” but the avoidance of pitch repetition definitely was not part of Webern’s compositional strategy in this sketch; there are several such repetitions. On the other hand, the creation of a musical rhyme, expressed as an identical interval pattern between “es nicht weiß” in m.

---

<sup>138</sup>The manuscript also preserves an alternate version of the vocal line in m. 11, which sets the syllables “Himmel hilft es” to eighth notes on the pitches b<sup>1</sup>-d<sup>2</sup>-b<sup>=</sup><sup>1</sup>-a<sup>2</sup>. 
10 and “Höller heiß” in m. 12 (preceded in both instances by unordered pcs E-E=), makes $c>^2$ an attractive solution. Webern emphasized a verbal rhyme with congruent pitch sequences in the 103-0760 version of “In tiefster Schuld,” and he may have done so in this sketch with an identical intervallic pattern.

“Flieder,” M. 246

The compositional materials for Webern’s settings of Kraus’s poem “Flieder,” M. 246, are preserved in four one-page pencil sketches. Each of the four sketches is fragmentary, providing a vocal line adequate to set only the first of the poem’s three quatrains. Three of the manuscripts were dated “1920” by the composer, and in one of these (103-0791) he included the inscription “Mödl,” indicating that the sketches were created in the Viennese suburb of Mödling, where the Webern family lived from the summer of 1918 to January 1932. The fourth “Flieder” manuscript, 103-0790, was indecisively dated “1920 o[der] 21,” displaying an uncertainty that is unlikely to have afflicted the fastidious composer until after many years had passed. This manuscript is dirtier and in generally worse condition than the other three, perhaps having fared less well in the ravages of spring 1945. The fact that three of the “Flieder” manuscripts were dated decisively and are in good condition, whereas 103-0790 was dated with incertitude and is in poorer condition, suggests that these manuscripts may have been separated at some point; certainly they were not dated at the same time.

None of the “Flieder” manuscripts contains a precise date, but it is very likely that Webern created these sketches during July and August of 1920. Other activities, primarily his intense involvement with Schoenberg’s projects, had kept Webern very busy.

---

139“Flieder” was first published in Die Fackel 508-13 (mid-April 1919): 21; the poem also appeared in volume 4 of Worte in Versen, published that same year.

140See Chronicle, 277 and 740-412, for Moldenhauer’s description of the “Flieder” manuscripts.
during the first half of that year. The second concert season of the Verein für musikalische Privataufführungen commanded much of Webern’s time until the early summer, and he was also Schoenberg’s primary assistant in the preparation for two performances of the master’s Gurrelieder, which Schoenberg conducted at the Vienna State Opera on 12 and 13 June.\textsuperscript{141} It was probably only after Webern’s mountain vacation in late June that he began to compose again in earnest.\textsuperscript{142} Even then, Webern’s frustration at his inability to compose effectively during what was typically his most productive time of year is reflected in a 17 August letter to Berg, in which he laments that he has produced nothing.\textsuperscript{143} Any compositional activity in August was effectively ended when Webern returned to Prague for his final brief engagement at the theater there. Shreffler’s list of Webern manuscripts from 1920 contains 18 separate fragmentary sketches, all but two of which are for songs, but no continuity drafts or completed compositions.\textsuperscript{144} The only sketch from 1920 that ultimately resulted in a completed work is a preliminary sketch of op. 15 no. 3, which was written in the same bifolio that contains “Flieder” sketch 103-0793.

**Dissimilarity and Sequence of Manuscripts**

Among Webern’s Kraus sketches those of “Flieder” provide the best example of the composer’s proclivity for sketching and re-sketching numerous and widely various settings of the same poem, especially since, as was most often the case during this period, his efforts with “Flieder” never resulted in a completed work. Moldenhauer described the four settings of “Flieder” as “each distinctly different,”\textsuperscript{145} and close study and comparison

\textsuperscript{141}Stuckenschmidt, Arnold Schoenberg, 266; Chronicle, 233.

\textsuperscript{142}Chronicle, 234-35.

\textsuperscript{143}This letter is briefly mentioned but not cited by Moldenhauer in Chronicle, 268.

\textsuperscript{144}“Webern’s Trakl Settings,” 335-36.

\textsuperscript{145}Chronicle, 277.
reveals them to be four very different conceptions of this song. Beyond unsurprising similarities of text declamation, texture, and the general make-up of the ensemble, many particulars of which vary widely on all counts, the four settings share very few musical features. Webern obviously began each separate attempt anew, providing the most recent sketch with what Shreffler called “the fresh impetus of a new idea,” yet the sketches are not completely unrelated. In the case of the “Flieder” manuscripts there are enough musical correspondences between the various versions to allow informed speculation with regard to their compositional sequence, although the order suggested here is intended only to facilitate discussion and is by no means certain or definitive. Example 4.31 provides for comparison the entire vocal lines of the four “Flieder” sketches in one plausible order. The sequence proposed in Example 4.31 is based primarily on similarities and differences among the four vocal lines, although this hypothesis also takes into account the compositional strategies revealed in each sketch. For example, the last sketch listed in this example, 103-0790, is the most complete and detailed of the four, but it is also the most musically disparate and therefore the most difficult to order. 103-0790 is also the only version of “Flieder” that is not in 3/4 meter, and it contains more dotted rhythms than the others. This manuscript is listed last in Example 4.31 and discussed last in the manuscript descriptions to follow not only because of its length or detailed conception, but because it contains isolated musical features that may have

Lyric Impulse, 59.

The measure numbers in Example 4.31 are provided to simplify discussion and are not in accord with the measure numbers in each individual manuscript, which vary widely. Blank measures (mm. 4 and 8) have been inserted in the 103-0788 vocal line in order to keep the versions as closely aligned as possible and to facilitate comparison. Several measures contain notes in alternate notation (for instance 103-0793 m. 3) to account for multiple layers of revisions that appear in the manuscript; the notes in alternate notation are earlier, replaced or deleted layers. The ossia measure above mm. 1-2 contains a possible alternate version of the vocal figure in 103-0788. 103-0788 also contains three different settings of the final word, “Flieder,” as shown in mm. 10-12. Most of these revisions and multiple settings are discussed in detail in the following sections that describe the individual manuscripts.
originated in the other versions. The earliest measures of 103-0790 also exhibit a compositional strategy, namely the use of octatonic subsets, that is somewhat similar to that of 103-0791, although the octatonic sonorities in 103-0791 are much more prominent and demonstrably intentional. “Flieder” versions 103-0791 and 103-0790 are also most similar rhythmically, despite many differences of melodic contour. Nonetheless, it is not impossible that 103-0790 is the earliest of the sketches, though it seems unlikely to have fallen between any two of the others.

“Flieder” sketch 103-0788, possibly the earliest version, is the only setting of the poem that does not employ a small orchestra. It is also the most rudimentary of the four fragmentary sketches, having a well-developed vocal setting of the first stanza but only six or seven beats of tentatively notated piano accompaniment. More important than the sketch’s ensemble and length, however, is the fact that 103-0788 exhibits musical characteristics that may have been carried over into 103-0793 and 103-0791. For instance, in mm. 1-2 the melodic contours of the first three versions, especially those of 103-0788 and 103-0791, are very similar, whereas 103-0790 is the only version that does not employ an eighth rest in response to the comma between the syllables “doch” and “s’ist”\(^{148}\) in m. 2.\(^{149}\) The eighth rest after “Nun” in m. 1 (scratched out in 103-0788) and the contour of m. 2 might suggest that 103-0791 should follow 103-0788 sequentially, yet in m. 3 the contours of 103-0788 and 103-0793 are the most similar. The melodic contours setting “Ich sah es nicht vor so viel Nacht,” mm. 3-6, are identical in the first three sketches, despite slight rhythmic and interval differences. The settings of the third poetic line, “und lange hatt’ ich’s nicht ge[dacht],” in 103-0793 and 103-0791 mm. 6-7 demonstrate isolated and perhaps coincidental pitch relationships: in 103-0793 there is a $g^=\text{1}$ on second syllable of “lange,” and in 0791 there is an $f^<\text{1}$ on the first; in 103-0793 “hatt’ ich’s” is set to $f^\text{1}-a^\text{1}$, but in 103-0791 the pitches are reversed, and the pitch $b^=\text{1}$

\(^{148}\)The fifth syllable of the poem’s first line is the contraction “‘s ist,” which Webern consistently spelled as “s’ist,” as it appears in Examples 4.31 and 4.33.

\(^{149}\)In Example 4.31 m. 2 103-0793 and 103-0791 contain an ic 4 between “weiß” and “ich,” and all but 103-0790 contain an ic 1 interval between “ich” and “doch.”
Example 4.31: “Flieder,” M. 246, comparison of vocal lines
underlies the syllable “nicht” in both settings. The correspondence among the first three manuscripts is most striking in the setting of the poem’s last line, “Nun merk’ ich erst, schon blüht der Flieder” in mm. 7-12. All three of these versions set “Nun” to pc E=(e=1 in the earlier layer of 103-0788 m. 7 and e=2 in 103-0793 and 103-0791 m. 8) and then move upward to g<2 in 103-0788 or g=2/f<2 in 103-0793 and 103-0791. At some point Webern revised the earlier lilting rhythm of “merk’ ich erst” in 103-0788 m. 9 to a triplet figure, as subsequently appears in the 103-0793. The setting of “Nun merk’ ich erst” in 103-0791 is rhythmically augmented, imitating the setting of “‘s ist Frühling wieder” in mm. 2-4 of the same sketch, and the melody line draws pitches from both preceding versions, the e=2-f<2 on “Nun merk” from 103-0793 and the e<2-f on “ich erst” from 103-0788. After the eighth rest following “erst”—again absent only in 103-0790—the final version of “schon blüht der Flieder” in 103-0788 (mm. 9 and 12, f<2-e=2-e<2-d<1) shares the e on “der” with the post correcturam version in 103-0793. Both 103-0791 and 103-0790 place that syllable on e=1. The first syllable of “Flieder” is set to pc C in both the final versions of 103-0788 and 103-0791, although in 103-0793 the c<1 appears on that syllable only in an earlier, scratched out layer. Finally, the revised setting of “Flieder” in 103-0793 resolves upward a tritone (f<1-b<1), as does the figure in 103-0791 (c<1-f<1), but both 103-0790 and most versions of 103-0788, including the final layer, resolve the phrase either up or down a major seventh.

The extensive use of the major seventh interval at the vocal cadences that conclude each poetic line is a trait common to “Flieder” sketches 103-0788 and 103-0790, whereas this interval concludes only one vocal phrase in 103-0793 (both settings of “wieder” in m. 3) and does not appear at the end of any vocal phrase in 103-0791. Major sevenths conclude the first and fourth end-rhymed phrases in both 103-0788 (e=1-d<2 in m. 3 and e<2-e=1 in m. 10 or e=2-e<1 in m. 11 or c<2-d<1 in m. 12) and 103-0790 (c<2-d<2 in m. 3 and b=a<1 in m. 10), and it is very likely that Webern intended to create these musical rhymes to correspond with the textual rhymes. A major seventh also sets “gedacht” at the

150In 103-0793 m. 9 f>2-c<1-e<1 is probably the revised version of “schon blüht der,” but all notes in this measure are very lightly and tentatively notated.
end of the third phrase in 103-0788 (b'c in m. 7), but this interval and pitches do not
create a musical rhyme to parallel the textual rhyme with the poem’s second line, which
ended with a minor third (d'-b on “viel Nacht” in mm. 5-6). In 103-0790 Webern created
another form of musical rhyme by setting both “viel Nacht” (c^2-c< in mm. 5-6) and
“gedacht” (d^2-c< in mm. 7-8) to ic 1 intervals that conclude on the same pitch, c<. The
common pitch musical rhyme was employed in 103-0791 as well, in which both the first
and fourth phrases conclude with the pitch f< (a^1-f< in m. 4 and c^1-f< in m. 11), but the
end-rhyme that links the second and third poetic lines was musically realized by neither a
common interval nor pitch but by the repeat of an interval class, ic 5 (c<g< in mm. 5-6
and a^1-e in mm. 7-8). In 103-0793 the rhyme scheme of the music seems at odds with
that of the poem; both the first and second lines end on pc C (d'=c^2 in m. 3 and e^1-c in
mm. 5-6), and the third and fourth phrases end on pc B (d^1-b in mm. 7-8 and f^1-b in m.
10). The four settings of “Flieder” thus demonstrate three different techniques of
associating a verbal rhyme with a musical one. In this regard manuscripts 103-0793 and
103-0791 are both quite distinct, and 103-0788 and 103-0790 appear to be the most
similar, contradicting the compositional order suggested by Example 4.31.

There are in fact strong relationships between 103-0790 and both 103-0788 and
103-0793 that suggest a compositional sequence more complicated and less linear than
that presented in Example 4.31. For example one version of 103-0788 and 103-0790 set
“Nun” in m. 1 to b=, and the alternate vocal line in 103-0788 mm. 1-2 (ossia measure
above staff 1 of Example 4.31) shares the pitches b'f< and b'= setting “weiß ich doch”
with 103-0790, although the b' and f< are not in the same layer of 103-0790. It is the
rhythmic interpretation of the text that most closely links 103-0788 and 103-0790,
especially the use of dotted rhythms in the declamation of “so viel” in m. 5, “lange” in
mm. 6-7, and “merk ich erst” in m. 9. In the last phrase these two manuscripts also share
the pitch g<2/a=2 on the word “merk’.” The correlations between the vocal lines of
“Flieder” sketches 103-0793 and 103-0790 primarily involve isolated coincidences of
rhythm and pitch: in m. 3 both versions set “Frühling” to a dotted rhythm and the first
syllable of “wieder” to pc C< (d'= in 103-0793 and c<2 in 103-0790) followed by a
major seventh leap to the second syllable; only these two versions have the long caesura in m. 4 between the end of the first line and the beginning of the second; in m. 5 both set “nicht” to e\(^1\); in m. 6 these two versions temporarily change to duple meter; and in m. 7 both versions set “ge[dacht]” to pc D (d\(^1\) in 103-0793 and d\(^1\) then d\(^2\) in 103-0790).

Comparison of the four “Flieder” vocal settings reveals that pairs of manuscripts that are not adjacent in the order imposed by Example 4.31 share pitch-syllable correlations, melodic rhythms and contours, and technical approaches to musical problems, such as techniques of associating verbal and musical rhymes. These relationships, many of which seem more than coincidental, suggest that the composer consulted his earlier settings of “Flieder” while engaged in each successive attempt. Such a procedure would explain, for example, why the vocal line of 103-0790 mm. 3-4 is so similar to that of 103-0793, while the following m. 5 seems to combine rhythmic elements of both 103-0791 and 103-0788.\(^{151}\) Many similar examples have already been demonstrated. Unlike some other poems, such as Kraus’s “Wiese im Park” or several by Trakl,\(^{152}\) for which Webern generated multiple settings over a period of years, the four “Flieder” manuscripts were almost certainly created in a relatively short period of time, less than two months, in a single setting, Mödling. It seems probable that Webern had all previous versions of “Flieder” in front of him while working, and that he purposefully explored new ideas while also consciously adapting isolated aspects of the earlier settings. In such a scenario superimposing a clear chronological order on these fragmentary settings may in fact be inappropriate and might only obscure a fascinating aspect of Webern’s compositional practice, namely that in the “Flieder” manuscripts

\(^{151}\)In manuscript 103-0790 the vocal declamation of “sah es nicht vor so viel” was written in unpitched rhythmic notation above m. 5. The only other unpitched declamation rhythms written in 103-0790 appear above the setting of “merk’ ich erst, schon blüht der” in mm. 8-10. In both cases the vocal rhythm appears to be a combination of rhythms found in two earlier versions. The only other unpitched vocal declamation rhythms found in the “Flieder” manuscripts appear in 103-0793 above mm. 1-2.

\(^{152}\)Shreffler provides a list of Webern’s multiple settings between 1913-1924, including of course all of his Trakl sketches, in *Lyric Impulse*, 61.
Webern did not develop musical ideas from one sketch to the next in a linear development, nor did he consciously ignore his earlier sketches, but rather he used the earlier sketches freely, as raw material to be assimilated into an entirely new musical conception. As the following descriptions of each manuscript will demonstrate, the result of this rather unusual compositional process is four distinct yet loosely linked musical conceptions.

**PSS 103-0788**

“Flieder” manuscript 103-0788 is a single-page, fragmentary pencil sketch, comprising approximately 14 measures of music for soprano voice, ranging from a to b=2, and piano.\(^{153}\) 103-0788 is an eleven-stave, oblong-format half-sheet torn from its bifolio on the right edge and into a half-sheet across the top. There is no paper manufacturer’s stamp on either side of the sheet. The eleven staves on this page are divided into three systems of 3, 4 and 3 staves, respectively, leaving the eleventh staff empty.\(^{154}\) The lower two staves of each system are not distinctly bracketed together as part of a grand staff, and the clefs are missing from all but staves 2, 3 and 8, but the absence of instrumental abbreviations and a pedal indication (“Ped.”) in the first measure (labeled 1A in Example 4.25) leave little doubt as to the intended scoring. This sketch is the only setting of “Flieder” that does not call for an instrumental chamber ensemble. As in many other abandoned song sketches, the vocal line of 103-0788 is significantly more developed than the accompaniment. The piano part was composed only through the first five measures—two of which are circled for deletion—and is nearly all contained in

---

\(^{153}\) A number of missing barlines and the fact that some measures contain overlapping, unrelated musical figures (as will be described below) makes it difficult to assign a measure count to this sketch. There are also multiple alternate versions of some measures, reducing the total count from approximately 14 overall to 8 in the final layer.

\(^{154}\) The seventh staff is also mostly empty and contains only a quarter rest and two quarter-note dyads that fall under m. 1A, according to the enumeration of measures in Example 4.25. The ninth and tenth staff lines contain no music and are not shown in the example.
system 2; the last eight measures—nearly all of systems 1 and 3—contain the vocal line alone. There are no dynamics or other expressive or articulation markings in the sketch, except for the aforementioned pedal indication and a few staccato markings in the piano part of m. 2B.

103-0788 is the only manuscript in the set that is not dated on the side of the “Flieder” setting; rather, this “Flieder” setting occupies the verso side of a loose leaf that has the date “1920” in the upper right corner of its recto. The recto of 103-0788, the microfilm of which is cataloged as 103-0787, contains short pencil sketches of two other songs. The first system contains a fragmentary setting of Georg Trakl’s “Die Heimkehr,” M. 248, for soprano and a typical Webernian chamber ensemble. This five-measure sketch on Trakl’s poem continues at the beginning of the second system and then stops. After a small blank space Webern drew a bracketed grand staff in the lower two staves of the second system and sketched the first four measures of a voice and piano setting of Thu-Fu’s poem “Frühlingsregen,” M. 244, as it appeared in Bethge’s free translation Die chinesische Flöte.

Example 4.32 provides a diplomatic transcription of 103-0788 in which the measures have been numbered to illustrate the musical order of the sketch, for the manner in which Webern used the space on the page makes the musical sequence of the measures

---

155 The designation of this folio’s sides as recto and verso is according to the archival pagination of the items in the “Flieder” folder at the PSS. Each side of each manuscript has a small boxed-in number in the lower left or right margin. Manuscript page 103-0787 was designated as side 9 and 103-0788 as side 10.

156 According to my reading, the instrumental abbreviations appearing in the 103-0787 version of “Die Heimkehr” call for flute, bass clarinet, horn, glockenspiel, harp, harmonium, cello, and double bass. In her dissertation Shreffler lists the instruments in this manuscript slightly differently; see “Webern’s Trakl Settings,” 335-36. She also lists two other sketch fragments on this Trakl poem. Moldenhauer’s Works List includes only two sketches of “Die Heimkehr”; see Chronicle, 276, 738-39.

157 Shreffler’s and Moldenhauer’s descriptions of the “Der Frühlingsregen” manuscripts do not agree with regard to instrumentation and number of measures. See “Webern’s Trakl Settings,” 335 and Chronicle, 277 and 740-41.
Measures 1C crosses the barline to include both the descending $f-\text{c}^-2-\text{f}^s$ triplet and the two beats that follow.

Example 4.32: “Flieder,” M. 246, PSS 103-0788, diplomatic transcription

rather difficult to interpret. In Example 4.32 the measure numbers followed by letters designate measures that appear in the manuscript in several alternate versions, and the sequence of the letters represents the most likely order of composition. For example, there appear to be three versions of the piano accompaniment of the first measure: the lower two staves at the beginning of the uppermost system, labeled m. 1A; the lower three staves at the beginning of the second system, labeled m. 1B; and the lower two staves of the measure in the second system, labeled 1C.\textsuperscript{158} As shown in the diplomatic

\textsuperscript{158}Measure 1C crosses the barline to include both the descending $f-\text{c}^-2-\text{f}^s$ triplet and the two beats that follow.
transcription, clefs were written at the beginnings of staves 2 and 3 (system 1), suggesting that Webern started the sketch in the uppermost system and that the ascending sixteenth-note piano figure of m. 1A constitutes the earliest conception of the introductory measure. The crowded placement of the eighth rest and E= beneath the time signature of staff 3 suggests that they were added after the c-e-c<\text{1/16}>-f<\text{1/16}> sixteenth notes. The vocal staff above m. 1A is largely unrelated to m. 1A but rather is an alternate setting of “schon blüht der Flieder,” also set in mm. 7A-8A and 7B-8B, and therefore is designated as mm. 7C-8C. After the right barline of m. 8C the a<\text{2/4}> quarter note appears above and in vertical alignment with the b<\text{1/4}> quarter note of the m. 1A piano part, suggesting that the a<\text{2/4}>-b<\text{1/4}>-f<\text{1/16}>-b= figure in the first staff might be a vocal setting of the first four syllables (“Nun weiß ich doch”); this figure is therefore labeled mm. 1A-2A, although the text does not appear in the manuscript.\textsuperscript{159} After sketching alternate versions of the opening piano figure and vocal line in the middle system (mm. 1B-3A), Webern continued the sketch in the third system (mm. 3B-6) and ultimately concluded the vocal setting of the first stanza in the uppermost system (mm. 7A-8A or 7B-8B or 7C-8C).

Determining the order of alternative readings in the earliest measures is particularly difficult. The sequence of these versions might be the same as that implied by the letters assigned to the measure numbers—i.e., 1A, 1B, then 1C—but this is not certain. The piano parts of measures 1B and 1C are obviously similar; they share nearly every pc, most in the same octave and order, as well as identical contours and a similar rhythmic concept. Not including the two dyads in staff 4 of m. 1B, which were undoubtedly added after the e=.-b-d<\text{1/4}> trichord (staff 3) was circled for deletion, and ignoring the circles in m. 1C, the piano parts of mm. 1B and 1C share pitches f<\text{<2}> c<\text{<2}> f<\text{<5}> d<\text{1/4}> b and e=. The revision of m. 1B deleted the b, lowered the octave of pcs D and E=, and added the A=.-g dyad. Measure 1C contains the b and includes pcs A= and G in

\textsuperscript{159}Example 4.32 shows an indistinct scribble in staff 1 between the a<\text{2/4}> and b<\text{1/4}> of mm. 1A-2A that could be a partially erased or poorly formed note or barline. The reading above assumes that it is a barline, largely due to the alignment of the piano b<\text{1/4}> and the upper stave’s a<\text{2/4}> and the alignment of the scribble with the barline after piano m. 1A.
Interestingly, mm. 2A (b\textsuperscript{1}-f<\textsuperscript{1}-b=), 1B (staff 2, f<\textsuperscript{2}-c<\textsuperscript{2}-f\textsuperscript{3}), 1C, 3B (e\textsuperscript{2}-b\textsuperscript{1}-e=\textsuperscript{1}) and 4 (f\textsuperscript{2}-c\textsuperscript{2}-e\textsuperscript{1} and e=\textsuperscript{2}-b=\textsuperscript{1}-d\textsuperscript{1}) all contain transpositions of the same interval pattern, a descending perfect fourth followed by a descending augmented fifth. In mm. 1B (f\textsuperscript{2}-e\textsuperscript{3}), 3B (e=\textsuperscript{1}-d\textsuperscript{2}) and 4 (e\textsuperscript{1}-e=\textsuperscript{2}) the pattern is followed by an ascending major seventh.
Interpreters of Webern’s manuscripts must avoid the temptation to force a clean and straightforward interpretation on a process that sometimes was obviously very messy.

Measures 3A and 3B of Example 4.32 are so designated because it is unclear whether or not the lower two staves of m. 3A should underlay the setting of “Frühling” on beat 1 of m. 3B, although this seems unlikely since the composer separated the two figures. It is most likely that m. 3A represents a one-beat interlude between the words “s ist” and “Frühling,” although no punctuation appears at that point in the poem. The clef in the lowest staff of m. 3A is uncertain, since there is a treble clef in that staff in m. 2B. In either clef, however, setting the vocal line of m. 3B above the piano part of m. 3A would lead to a doubling of the $e^2$ on “Früh[ling],” either at the same pitch (in treble clef) or at three octaves below (in bass clef).

The setting of “schon blüht der Flieder,” the last five syllables of the first stanza, appears in three versions in manuscript 103-0788. The setting of these words in mm. 7A-8A was enclosed in brackets by the composer, as shown in Example 4.32. All three alternate versions of the setting, mm. 7A-8A, 7B-8B and 7C-8C, have similar rhythms and contours. All three versions also set the stanza’s last word, “Flieder,” to a major seventh, creating a musical rhyme with the major seventh on “wieder” in m. 3B, although in m. 8A the last note, $e^=$, was replaced by $c<^=$, reducing the concluding interval to a major sixth. Measures 7A-8A and 7C-8C, the latter of which has no text, share the pitches $f<^=$ $e^=$ and $e^=$ and the pc $C<$, the last of which is spelled as $d^=^1$ in m. 8C. The version appearing in mm. 7B-8B, also missing the text, is the most dissimilar, but still it includes the pitches $g<^2$ $e<^2$ and $e^=$ that appear in the other two versions and the pitch $g^=$ on “der” as in m. 7A. Here again, the sequence of the revisions is uncertain, although the order suggested by the assigned measure numbers appears most likely. It is hard to imagine that Webern would have sketched in the space occupied by m. 7C-8C before the rest of that staff was full. More uncertain is whether the brackets around the mm. 7A-8A version of “schon blüht der Flieder” indicate that the figure should be replaced by a revised version, either 7B-8B or 7C-8C, or whether the final version of the setting was written over an erasure in mm. 7A-8A and then bracketed to indicate the final version.
PSS 103-0793

Unlike the other three sketches of “Flieder,” which are all loose leaves, 103-0793 was written on the last page (side 4 or 2r) of an intact bifolio. This bifolio is a 16-stave, vertical format whole sheet. The paper is dark brown and appears to have deteriorated rapidly. This version of “Flieder” is a fragmentary pencil sketch, comprising 10 measures of music for soprano voice, ranging from $b=$ to either $g^2$ or $a^2$, and an instrumental ensemble of the following ten instruments: flute, clarinet, bass clarinet, horn, trombone, celesta, harp, violin, viola, and cello (see Example 4.33). The date “1920” is written in Webern’s hand in the upper right corner of the page. The sketch is written in short-score format in three systems of 4, 3 and 3 staves each, although the second system contains the vocal line only and the third holds only the two notes that set the word “Flieder.” The first two measures are cleanly and confidently notated, but after m. 2 the music becomes increasingly cluttered with several layers of circled, scratched out and revised figures. The resulting clutter makes it difficult to ascertain the final layer or sequence of revisions in some parts, especially the instrumental parts of m. 3 and the vocal setting of “[Ich] sah es nicht vor so viel [Nacht]” (line 2) in m. 5. The instrumental

161 The middle two sides of the bifolio (1v and 2r) are blank, but the first page (1r) contains a fragmentary sketch of the third of the Five Sacred Songs, op. 15, “In Gottes Namen aufstehn.” Like the “Flieder” sketch, this manuscript page is dated “1920” in the upper right corner. This preliminary sketch of approximately 23 measures preserves a version of op. 5 no. 3 that is markedly different from the published version. The music is written in short-score format on four systems of three to four staves each. Instrumental abbreviations for clarinet, cello, and a muted trombone appear in the sketch, but there is very little instrumental music to accompany the well-developed vocal line. This is the only known preliminary sketch that precedes the continuity draft dated 3 September 1921. The fair copy of op. 15 no. 3 was also created in the fall of 1921. See Shreffler, “Webern’s Trakl Settings,” 336.

162 The vocal line contains an $a^2$ in m. 9, but it is difficult to determine whether this version of the vocal line constitutes the final layer in that measure. The $a^2$ might have been replaced by an $f^2$ or vice versa.

163 In m. 3 one note for the bass clarinet is written in the fifth system, as shown in Example 4.33.
parts in mm. 1-4 of the manuscript are carefully orchestrated and feature detailed expressive and articulation markings, but the instrumental parts stop just as the poem’s second line begins at the end of m. 4.

Example 4.33 provides a transcription of “Flieder” manuscript 103-0793. The brief instrumental introduction in m. 1 may be divided into three principal motives—the two melodic figures of the bass clarinet and violin and the repeated major seventh dyad \((e^1-e^2)\) in the strings. Like the m. 1A version of 103-0788, the 103-0793 sketch begins with an ascending sixteenth-note gesture, in this case for the solo bass clarinet. Although it is uncertain—though very likely—that the \(g^1\) of staff 2 beat 2 should be played by the bass clarinet, the rhythmic values and positioning of rests in m. 1 staff 2 make it clear that the violin line begins on the \(a^2\) and continues through the \(a^1-f^1-g\) triplet. Once again, the composer delineated the first musical subsection through the completion of an aggregate. The combined instrumental parts of m. 1 create a ten-pitch chromatic field (pc G appears twice as \(g^1\) and g) that omits only pcs C, \(C^<\) and D. The vocalist provides the pc C when she enters on \(c^2\), and the sketch’s first aggregate is complete when the clarinet’s three-note solo resolves from \(d^2\) to \(c^1\) in m. 2. The clarinet completes the first aggregate just as the voice concludes the first musical phrase with a parallel ic 1

\[164\] This transcription is not diplomatic and therefore does not reproduce the stem directions or relative spatial arrangement of the musical figures. The transcription also does not include all of the deleted layers appearing in the original, particularly in mm. 3 and 5, but some of the clearer early layers are included in alternate notation. No editorial clefs or time signatures have been inserted. The 3/4 time signature in m. 9 was actually written between the first and second staves of the second system. Both systems 2 and 3 of Example 4.33 have been optimized to remove the blank staves.

\[165\] Two versions of the accompaniment in 103-0788 m. 1B also have an open major-seventh dyad in the bass line (staves 3 and 4).

\[166\] Not only do the opening bass clarinet tetrachord and first four vocal pitches both start with a rising perfect fourth, these two motives also share ordered pcs F and \(F^<\) separated by a different pitch. Both of these four-note figures also span the interval of an octave plus tritone or tritone, respectively (\(F\) to \(b\) in m. 1 and \(c^2\) to \(f^1\) in m. 2). Interestingly, the pc \(B^=\) is in the clarinet line of m. 2, so that the introductory bass clarinet figure and the first vocal line (plus clarinet figure) share pcs \(F\) \(F^<\) \(G\) and \(B^=\) .
descent (g₁ to f<₁), and the rests that appear in all four staves approximate the comma after “doch.” The aural impression of the introductory subsection is strongly chromatic and does not exhibit the octatonic sonorities so prominently featured in two other “Flieder” sketches, 103-0790 and 103-0791; the opening bass clarinet figure is not an octatonic subset, the violin line in m. 1 is a purely chromatic pc set, and the first four pitches of the vocal line are nearly so (c²-f⁰-g⁰₁-f<₁).

As is typical of Webern’s song composition style, the musical material of the instrumental introduction provides the motivic basis for the musical figures that follow. For example, the interval of a perfect fourth, first heard between the first two pitches of

Example 4.33: “Flieder,” M. 246, PSS 103-0793, transcription
the piece (F-B= in the bass clarinet m. 1), also appears between the first two pitches of
the first vocal entrance in mm. 1-2 (c<sup>2</sup>-f<sup>2</sup> on “Nun weiß”) and again in the bass clarinet in
m. 2 staff 3 (e=-a=). Likewise, the second phrase of the piece, which begins on m. 2
beat 2 with the ascending sixteenth-note figures in the bass clarinet and harp, opens with
an E-e= dyad one octave below that of m. 1 staff 3 (cello and viola). The staccato
markings above the bass clarinet’s e= and a= in m. 2 imitate the pizzicato articulation of
the earlier repeated dyad. The return of the bass clarinet timbre, in addition to the fact
that both bass clarinet figures begin with an ascending perfect fourth, makes the
connection between the two bass clarinet figures clearly audible. Other more obscure
(or at least less aurally perceptible) connections exist between other figures in the first
three measures. For example, the three-note clarinet figure of m. 2 staff 2 and the harp
figure in staff 3 of the same measure both constitute 3-3 pc sets, an extremely common
sonority in Webern’s music and the only octatonic subset to appear in multiple
transpositions in this sketch. The violin figure of m. 1 staff 2, a=2-a'-.f<1-g, was

167 The first three pcs of both the bass clarinet line in m. 1 and the vocal line in mm. 6-
7 (“und lange”) are F B= F<. Assuming that the composer followed the compositional
sequence seen in other song manuscripts, the instrumental parts of m. 1 were created first
and the vocal line of mm. 6-7 later.

168 The E-G-G<, harp figure of m. 2 staff 3 originally appeared two octaves higher in
the viola on beat 3, but the composer then circled and scratched out the viola figure and
rewrote it in the harp on beat 2. This revision created an interesting clef discrepancy in
this measure. The bass clarinet part of m. 2 must be in bass clef, since otherwise it would
begin on c=, an awkward and unlikely enharmonic spelling. The figure is also beamed to
and concluded in staff 2, as shown in Example 4.33, clearly indicating the clef
relationship between the two staves. The circled viola figure on beat 3 of m. 2 staff 3,
however, must be in treble clef; otherwise, the entire figure is too low for viola and would
conclude on B<1, another awkward enharmonic spelling. The third staff is also treble clef
in m. 3, for otherwise the first pitch, b in treble clef but D in bass clef, would be too low
for violin, and the last pitch of the viola figure (beamed from the staff below) would be
yet another awkward enharmonic spelling (C= in bass clef).

169 Other linear 3-3 sets in this sketch are in the viola in m. 2 staff 3 (e'-.g-.g<, the
same pcs as the harp figure immediately previous), the violin in mm. 3-4 staff 2 (e=3-.b<-
c<sup>2</sup>), the horn in m. 4 staff 3 (f<1-.d<1-f), the last three pitches of vocal line in mm. 5-6 (c<2-
e<1-c<1), the last three pitches of vocal line in mm. 7-8 (b=.-d<1-b), the first four pitches of
apparently the model for the cello gesture in mm. 2-3 staff 4, c-b-d\textsuperscript{1}-C<. Although they sound quite different, sharing neither rhythm nor contour, both figures begin and end with an ic 1 interval, contain a minor third in the middle, and comprise chromatic 4-1 pc sets.

Webern explicitly indicated the voice-leading of the cello line between mm. 2 and 3 by drawing a slanted line that connects the cello’s d to the C< on the downbeat of m. 3 staff 4.\textsuperscript{170} Another slanted line also crosses the barline between mm. 2 and 3 to connect the celesta’s b\textsuperscript{1} in staff 2 to the b in staff 3, even though the b is clearly designated for the violin.\textsuperscript{171} It may be that the b was originally included as the last pitch of the circled e\textsuperscript{1}-g\textsuperscript{1}-g< viola figure and that after revisions the composer considered giving this pitch first to the violin and then to the celesta, or vice versa. Otherwise, if the celesta is (or was) not supposed to play the b, it is not clear what function the slanted line was intended to serve.

On the last beat of m. 3 the vocal setting of “wieder,” the last word in the poem’s first line, elides with the beginning of a short instrumental interlude of approximately three beats (second eighth-note triplet of m. 3 beat 4 through the circled pitches in m. 4). This interlude is separated from the previous phrase by the eighth-note triplet rests on beat 4 of m. 3 staves 2-4 and elides with the beginning of the poem’s second line at the end of m. 4. Measure 4 was heavily revised and a large portion of the earliest visible layer was negated by the circle on beats 2 and 3, yet it appears that this instrumental

\begin{verbatim}

vocal line in mm. 8-9 (e=\textsuperscript{2}-g=\textsuperscript{2}-d\textsuperscript{1}-e=\textsuperscript{1}), and the next four pitches in same vocal phrase in mm. 9-10 (f\textsuperscript{2}-c<\textsuperscript{2}-e\textsuperscript{1}-f\textsuperscript{1}). The last two 3-3 sets in the voice (mm. 8-10) are framed by a repeated pcs, pc E= on “Nun” and “erst” and pc F on “schon” and “Flie[der].”

\textsuperscript{170} The “Br” (viola) below the f< on m. 3 beat 2 indicates that the viola line begins on that pitch. At some point the composer gave the A (second half of beat 1) between the cello’s C< and the viola’s f< to the bass clarinet, as shown in m. 3 staff 5 of Example 4.33.

\textsuperscript{171} Like the voice and clarinet on beats 1 and 2 of m. 2, the celesta and cello figures of mm. 2-3 conclude in roughly parallel motion of ic 1. Both lines that cross the mm. 2-3 barline connect a linear octatonic subset with a pitch that makes the set chromatic. The tetrachordal celesta figure, c\textsuperscript{3}-a\textsuperscript{2}-c<\textsuperscript{2}-b\textsuperscript{1}, is a 4-3 CIII pc set, but with the b it is a 5-1 pc set. Similarly, the trichordal c-b-d\textsuperscript{1} cello figure is a 3-3 CII pc set, but with the C< it is a 4-1.

\end{verbatim}
The dotted rhythm that appears twice in m. 4 staff 3 (first in the circled area and then in the horn) anticipates the dotted rhythm in the voice (“Ich” sah es nicht”), which was almost certainly written first. The interlude originally may have been based on the creation of an aggregate. The completion of this aggregate required five of the six pcs that appear in the circled area of beats 2 and 3; the d¹ in staff 3 is the only repeat of a pc, appearing earlier as d in the trombone. The large circle in m. 4 deleted pcs F F< G G< and C< from the aggregate, but the muted horn gesture after the circle (f<¹-d¹-f) reintroduces pcs F and F<, and pcs G< and C< appear in the vocal line in mm. 4 and 5 on the syllables “Ich” and “so,” respectively.¹² Pitch class G, however, does not appear again in this sketch. The composer may have purposefully withheld pc G in order to create a later cadence within the instruments. The instrumental parts of m. 4 might be incomplete, however, and there are no instrumental parts after this measure, so we can only speculate in this regard.

PSS 103-0791

“Flieder” manuscript 103-0791 is a single-page, fragmentary pencil sketch, comprising approximately 15 measures of music for soprano voice, ranging from b= to g<², and an instrumental ensemble of the following nine instruments: flute, clarinet, trumpet, horn, trombone, glockenspiel, harp, violin, and cello. Sketch page 103-0791 is a 14-stave oblong-format half-sheet torn on the top and right edges. There is a partial fifteenth staff at the top of the page. There is no paper manufacturer’s stamp on either side of the sheet, but there is a J.E. & Co. watermark. The verso of this sheet is blank. The sketch was written in short-score format in three systems of approximately 5, 5, and 3 staves, although some unorchestrated instrumental parts in mm. 10-11 have been revised as isolated figures in lower staves, expanding the second system to as many as 8 staves and overlapping the third system.¹³ The date and place name “1920 Mödl” are written in Webern’s hand in the upper right corner of the page. There are no dynamic or

¹² The dotted rhythm that appears twice in m. 4 staff 3 (first in the circled area and then in the horn) anticipates the dotted rhythm in the voice (“Ich sah es nicht”), which was almost certainly written first.

¹³ The third system is contained in staves 11-13, but revisions of musical figures in mm. 10 and 11 of system 2 were written below those measures in staves 11-13.
other expressive markings in the sketch, except for a “col legno” designation in the cello part of m. 9 on a repeated E= -B dyad. The instrumental parts of this setting continue almost to the end of the vocal music, leaving only the last six syllables of the poem’s fourth line without instrumental accompaniment, but the scoring of at least half of the instrumental parts is missing or ambiguous. Much of the page is very messy with revisions, and there are several straight or curved lines and arrows that connect instrumental figures between staves. These supplementary lines have been reproduced in the transcription provided as Example 4.34. Many of these supplementary lines appear merely to clarify voice leading or to indicate where various instrumental parts have been recomposed in other staves, but some of the curved lines may also have served as memory and organizational aids for the composer. As will be discussed in more detail below, at least two of these supplemental lines group pitches into octatonic subsets that span more than one staff or instrumental voice.

As can be seen in the octatonic analysis of mm. 1-11 provided as Example 4.35, the 103-0791 version of “Flieder” provides the most indisputable example of octatonic composition to be found among Webern’s Kraus sketches, particularly in the earliest measures. The octatonic orientation of the piece is revealed at the start of the

\[\text{\begin{footnotesize}174\end{footnotesize}}\] The transcription in Example 4.34 is not diplomatic and does not recreate the relative spacing of the figures in the original manuscript. Furthermore, Example 4.34 does not recreate the overlap of systems 2 and 3; i.e., in mm. 10-11 the figures in staves 6-8 (staves 11-13 in the original manuscript) appear to be on otherwise empty staves, but these staves are actually part of system 3 and contain the music seen in mm. 13-15. No editorial clefs have been added to the example.

\[\text{\begin{footnotesize}175\end{footnotesize}}\] As in the other octatonic analysis examples in this study, the pitches in the octatonic sets of Example 4.35 have been rhythmically “regularized” (rendered as beamed eighth-notes) in a manner similar to that appearing in Forte’s *The Atonal Music of Anton Webern*. The relative spacings of all pitches have been maintained, and the musical figures that are not part of labeled octatonic sets appear in their original rhythmic values. The orchestration indications, some rests, expressive markings, vocal text, and all other non-essential markings have been eliminated in order to reduce clutter. Measure 11 contains a tetrachord in the seventh and eighth staves of system 2 (included in Example 4.34) that is not included in Example 4.35. For an analysis of the final measures see Example 4.36.
Example 4.34: “Flieder,” M. 246, PSS 103-0791, mm. 1-11, transcription
As Examples 4.34 and 4.35 indicate the initial clef in staff 3 is treble clef, but the accidentals on the notes in the third and fourth spaces of the m. 5 staff 3 pentachord clearly indicate that the measure should be read in bass clef. The pentachord appears as a quarter note and is placed directly beneath and above the eighth rests on beat 2 of staves 2 and 5, although the pentachord is neither preceded nor followed by rests. The wavy line indicating the rolled chord may have forced the odd placement, so it is uncertain whether the pentachord should fall on beat 2 or earlier.

Webern drew two short slanted lines, reproduced in Example 4.34, between the e = and g < in this pentachord, separating the g <, a pc that had not yet appeared in the sketch, and b, a pc that had not yet appeared as part of a contiguous CII set (it appeared earlier as part of the 4-3 CI set), from the lower pitches D-A-e =, three pcs that already appeared as members of the contiguous CII sets of mm. 1 and 3-5.

The 8va indication above the glockenspiel line in m. 2 is not included in Example 4.35.

CI and CIII also share the pc E, which does not appear in this sketch until m. 5 staves 4 and 5.
Example 4.35: “Flieder,” M. 246, PSS 103-0791, mm. 1-11, octatonic sets
According to Forte the 6-Z50 is “heard only infrequently” in Webern’s published
music, although it is very characteristic of Stravinsky’s; see The Atonal Music of Anton
Webern, 14.

In Example 4.35 the horizontal bracket that extends below staff 2 from the
downbeat of mm. 3 to the downbeat of m. 4 demonstrates that the CIII subset could be
expanded to include the e^2 in a 5-16 CIII set. Even if the last four pitches of the
glockenspiel solo had been a precise retrograde of the first four, the CIII linear tetrachord
of m. 3 still would have elided with the following 4-18 CII of mm. 3-5, but the
“reordering” of a^2-e^2 in mm. 3-4 was necessary to create the pair of consecutive 4-3 sets
and preserve the symmetry of their ordered intervals.

The octatonic tetrachords of the introductory glockenspiel solo might be deemed
coincidental, a result merely of the composer’s apparent desire to create limited forms of
symmetry among the motivic cells of the introductory measures. Comparison with the
music that follows, however, reveals that these initial figures preface a clearly intentional
manipulation of octatonic formations. In Example 4.35 m. 5 staff 3 the vertical bracket to
the left of the harp tetrachord shows that the glockenspiel’s repeated f^<2 may be
combined with the tetrachord to form a 6-Z50 pc set from CII, a rather unusual sonority
for Webern.179 This 6-Z50 CII pc set omits only pcs C and F from the complete CII
eoctatonic collection, and these two pcs soon appear as the f^4 and c^1 that set the first two
syllables of the vocal line, “Nun weiß.” The c^1 on “weiß” also marks the completion of
the piece’s first aggregate, but the pitch’s placement does not suggest a cadential function
in the manner seen in other song sketches articulated by aggregates. The compositional
strategy in the earliest measures of this sketch definitely is not oriented primarily toward
the creation of aggregates but rather toward the expression of complete octatonic
collections. As Example 4.35 demonstrates, the initial vocal phrase in mm. 5-8 provides
the complete CII collection, doubling only the pc F, which sets the first and seventh
syllables (“Nun” and “[Früh]ling,” respectively) of the nine-syllable line. The first vocal
phrase concludes in m. 8 on the pitch f^<1, one octave below the pitch found at the
beginning, middle, and end of the opening glockenspiel solo. The CII octatonic

179 According to Forte the 6-Z50 is “heard only infrequently” in Webern’s published
music, although it is very characteristic of Stravinsky’s; see The Atonal Music of Anton
Webern, 14.
collection, centered around pc F<, is clearly the most prominent sonority in the first eight measures of this sketch. The piece begins with a tetrachordal reference to CII (m. 1), moves away from this sonority in the middle of the first melodic gesture (mm. 2-3), recapitulates the original CII tetrachord (mm. 3-5), and finally cadences the introduction with a clear hexachordal CII simultaneity (m. 5 downbeat). The vocal line begins with the two pitches from CII that are missing from the hexachord on the downbeat of m. 5 and then proceeds to express the entire collection, maintaining the octatonic purity of the nine-syllable line by repeating one pc.

In contrast, the instrumental accompaniment in mm. 5-8 is based on the other two octatonic collections. The short motives that comprised the two non-CII 4-3 sets of mm. 1-3 appear again in m. 5 without transposition and introduce complete expressions of their respective octatonic collections. As Example 4.35 shows, the f< on the downbeat of m. 5 staff 2 can be combined with the unorchestrated melodic line (perhaps still in the glockenspiel) that follows to provide a complete manifestation of CIII. The octatonic set is complete on the c< quarter note on m. 6 beat 2, but every pitch of m. 7 staff 2 is also drawn from CIII. Perhaps Webern placed two f< on the downbeat of m. 5 because this pitch both concludes the CII set and begins the CIII set. The strength of the 6-Z50 CII cadence on the downbeat of m. 5, the eighth rest that follows the second f<, and the change to a polyphonic texture strongly mark a sectional division and prevent the f< from sounding like part of the following melodic figure. Perhaps the weak aural connection between the f< on the downbeat of m. 5 and the following CIII set accounts for the lone f< played by the horn in m. 6 staff 4. The first linear tetrachord of the 8-28 CIII formation in mm. 5-7 maintains the exact pitches of the 4-3 CIII motive of m. 3, and

180 In m. 5 staff 2 the final note is indistinctly notated and may be either g< or a<, both of which are elements of CIII. The a< concurs, of course, with the motive in m. 3.

181 The manuscript contains the bass clef before the f< in m. 6 staff 4, as seen in Examples 4.34 and 4.35. Unless this is another instance of multiple clefs, the composer wrote both enharmonic spellings f< and g= in the measure. Since e= was written and then circled just below in staff 5, however, the last pitch in staff 4 may very well be e=.
the rhythms of these two figures are only slightly different. Interestingly, the first eight pitches of the 8-28 CIII in mm. 5-6, which present the entire octatonic collection, also manifest the palindromic interval class pattern of the combined 4-3 sets in mm. 1-3: 1-3-1-5-1-3-1. The fact that both the CII collection of the first vocal phrase and the CIII collection of staff 2 are each expressed within two separate, self-contained, and parallel melodic gestures is strongly suggestive of a conscious manipulation of octatonic sets.

The presentation of the remaining octatonic collection, CI, in mm. 5-8 is more convoluted yet nonetheless deliberate. The d\textsuperscript{3}-c\textsuperscript{4}<b\textsuperscript{3}-b\textsuperscript{2} motive, first heard as an isolated 4-3 CI set in mm. 1-2, reappears in m. 5 as an ordered set that preserves most of its rhythmic identity, although the contour has been altered by the octave displacement of pc D by three octaves. The 8\textsuperscript{va} indication above the original figure does not appear in m. 5, so the other three pitches are also one octave lower than before. Like the second appearance of the 4-3 CIII motive (f\textsuperscript{2}-g\textsuperscript{1}-b\textsuperscript{1}-a\textsuperscript{2}), the return of the 4-3 CI motive also introduces a complete statement of its octatonic collection. Example 4.35 shows that the lowest pitch of the harp pentachord, D, can be combined with the unorchestrated figure of m. 5 staff 5, the violin dyad of staff 4, and the first two pitches of m. 6 staff 3 to form a complete CI set.\textsuperscript{182} If the D of the harp pentachord is considered to be a part of the CI set, then the octatonic set is complete with the appearance of the f\textsuperscript{b} on the downbeat of m. 6 staff 3 (the first vocal note also completes CI), but Example 4.35 shows that the CI set could be continued in staff 3 into m. 8 until the e=\textsuperscript{2} eighth note interrupts on beat 2.\textsuperscript{183} If the harp’s D is not considered the first pitch of the CI set, then the d\textsuperscript{1} just before the “interrupting” e=\textsuperscript{2} of m. 8, which is simultaneous with the end of the vocal phrase, is necessary to complete the CI set. Unlike the complete CII and CIII sets seen in mm. 5-8 staves 1 and 2, the CI set diagramed in these measures is not contained in a single staff or

\textsuperscript{182}The b\textsuperscript{1} and g\textsuperscript{2} that are immediately repeated in m. 5 staff 5 (first as quarter notes then as eighth-notes) of Example 4.34 are depicted only once in Example 4.35, since this reduction decreases clutter without affecting the octatonic analysis.

\textsuperscript{183}The d\textsuperscript{2} and e\textsuperscript{1} on beat 3 of m. 8 staff 3 are circled individually in the manuscript but are rendered in alternate notation in Examples 4.34 and 4.35.
melodic figure, and its presentation is not nearly so definite. The beginning of the CI melodic figure in m. 5 staff 5 is very lightly and sloppily sketched, especially the last four eighth-notes of that measure (b^1-g^2-e^2-g<^1, shown in alternate notation in Example 4.34), which might be part of an earlier, incompletely erased figure. The problematic rhythm, the immediate repeat of b^1 and g^2, and the distorted right barline suggest that this measure, as it appears in the manuscript and Example 4.34, does not represent a finished musical concept. The figure in m. 5 staff 5 may only be a preliminary musical idea, obviously related to m. 2, that served as nothing more than a collection of pitches, perhaps explaining why Webern began to sketch in the fifth staff for the first time at this point. He may have ultimately decided against reiterating the figure from m. 2, as he had done with the figure appearing in mm. 3 and 5, but rather to dismantle the m. 2 figure and to disperse these and other CI pitches throughout the texture. If all of the pitches in m. 5 staff 5 are omitted from the 8-28 CI set, the remaining pitches beamed together in Example 4.35 mm. 5-8 (including the dyad in m. 5 staff 4) comprise a 7-31 CI set that omits only pc G< from the complete collection. The composer may have considered the g<^1 in m. 6 staff 5 (along with two other pitches from CI, e^1 and b<^1) or the g<^1 of m. 8 staff 4 (which sounds simultaneously with the e<^2 of staff 3 that interrupts the CI set) to provide the missing pc. The exposition of the complete CI instrumental set in mm. 5-8 is simply less definitive than that of the CII or CIII sets in the same measures, yet the tentatively notated figure of m. 5 staff 5 demonstrates that Webern continued to work with octatonic sets in every part.

As mentioned earlier, more evidence of a consciously octatonic compositional strategy is furnished by the telltale lines, arrows, and curves that Webern drew to connect some of the musical figures that span more than one staff. These supplementary markings have been reproduced in Example 4.34. The most interesting of these are the roughly S-shaped curves in mm. 5-6 that connect figures between staves 4 and 3 and in

---

184 Measure 5 staff 5 also contains what looks to be several very fine, straight, upward slanting lines, possibly intended to delete the entire figure, although the marks look most like abrasion damage that occurred after composition.
mm. 8-9 between staves 2 and 3. In mm. 5-6 this curved line connects the violin dyad in staff 4 to the following two eighth-notes of staff 3, forming a 4-Z15 CI set, part of the larger 7-31 CI set described previously. This curved line is also so situated as to exclude the f< in m. 6 staff 4 from the CI figure; pc F< is a member of both CII and CIII but not CI. The similar S-shaped marking in mm. 8-9 creates another 4-Z15 set, this time from CIII, by joining the descending b=²-g² eighth-notes of m. 8 staff 2 beat 2 to the c¹-f<¹-b=¹ trichord on the downbeat of m. 9 staff 3. Example 4.35 shows that the a on the downbeat of m. 9 staff 4 could also be joined to this figure, creating a 5-10 CIII figure. In neither of these two cases is the latter of the connected figures assigned to an instrument different than the first—i.e., in m. 5 “Geige” was written above the dyad and the following eighth-notes have no instrumental indication, and in mm. 8-9 neither half of the connected figure is explicitly scored—so there is no proof that these curved lines are more than mere orchestration indications. The fact that Webern may have chosen to distinguish these groups of pitches through timbre does not, of course, contradict the octatonic analysis and might be considered to support it.

Some of the other lines in the manuscript certainly do seem to be nothing more than orchestration markings: for instance in m. 6 staff 5, where the b=¹ is marked “Tromp” and connected by a straight line to the a marked “Tr.” In other instances the lines seem to contradict an octatonic reading, as in mm. 10 where the 4-3 CIII (c²-e=¹-c<²-e¹) in staff 6 is connected to the d² of m. 11 staff 5 (designated for the clarinet), making the resulting five-note figure a purely chromatic pc set. Finally, other lines and arrows seem only to indicate where figures have been recomposed in other staves, as in Example 4.34 m. 8, where the first note of the flute line (f¹) appears first in staff 4 but was then rewritten and the figure continued in staff 5.

After m. 8 Webern’s use of octatonic collections is less clearly defined, and complete octatonic collections no longer appear as contiguous pitches in a single staff or

---

185 The extraneous lines that connect musical figures in m. 5 staff 4 to those in m. 6 staff 3 and in m. 8 staff 2 to m. 9 staff 3 are roughly S-shaped in the original manuscript but are approximately rendered in Example 4.34 as jointed straight lines.
melodic figure. Several conspicuous octatonic subsets do occur in the later measures, however, both in the voice and instruments, suggesting that the composer experimented with various ways of dispersing the octatonic collections among the voices of the piece, but very few of the resulting linear motives exhibit the octatonic purity presented by the melodic figures of mm. 5-8. Example 4.35 contains several examples of melodic figures that are nearly octatonic subsets but that also contain a single pitch that does not share an octatonic origin with the others. For example, in mm. 8-9 staff 4 four of the five pitches in the horn’s melodic line comprise a 4-Z15 CIII pc set (5-32 CIII pc set including the deleted c on the downbeat of m. 9), but the figure also contains g<1, a pitch that is not part of CIII. Since the g<1 is not a member of CIII, this pitch retains its original rhythmic value in Example 4.35 (eighth-note tied to a quarter note) and is not beamed to the other notes in the figure. Also in m. 8 the six-pitch flute figure in staff 5 comprises a 4-10 CII pc set that is interrupted by the e1 that falls between the two pc E= s. In a more striking example, the second complete vocal phrase in mm. 8-10 (“Ich sah es nicht vor so viel Nacht”) provides the 7-31 CI pc set diagramed in Example 4.35 but also contains the c2 on “vor,” a pc not belonging to CI. Since the g<1 on “Nacht” on the downbeat of m. 10 replaced the previous b (crossed out in the manuscript and shown in alternate notation in all examples), the resulting vocal line is actually a 6-Z13 CI pc set that omits pcs B and

---

186 As shown in the transcription in Example 4.34, in m. 8 staff 4 the g<1 is attached by a line to both the deleted (circled) c in alternate notation and the a, both of which are members of CIII. It is interesting to note that mm. 8-9 contains two parallel 4-Z15 CIII sets in staves 2-3 and 4, but the analysis of the figure in staff 4 as an octatonic set is spurious.

187 The replaced b on the downbeat of m. 10 is marked out by a single slanted stroke, not erased or scratched out more fully, so perhaps it is not unreasonable to consider such pitches still “active” in the process of composition; i.e., this pitch was still clearly visible and open to consideration by the composer. Circling a pitch or figure works in much the same way, and Webern often marked out or circled and then reinserted figures, such as the trichord in m. 11 staff 3. From the standpoint of editing a final edition for performance, such a view provides too many options, but from the standpoint of compositional process, especially a process that is not yet complete, this view is appropriate.
In Example 4.36 the figures have been condensed into as few staves as possible to enhance clarity and reduce the size of the example. The two eighth-note figures that cross staves 2-3 and 3-4 in m. 9 staff 3 provides the missing pc B=; it is therefore connected to the vocal figure by a stem in Example 4.36. The pc B that was eliminated from the vocal line in m. 10 is found in the repeated E=B dyad of m. 9 staff 5, played by the cello col legno. Pitch class B also appeared as the top note of the trichord (A=-e=-b) in m. 9 staff 4 beat 2, but this trichord is circled in the manuscript and so included in alternate notation in the examples. Another pc A= is found on beat 3 of staff 4, one octave above the deleted A= on beat 2 of the same staff, as part of a rather oddly notated eighth-note figure that spans staves 3 and 4. In Example 4.35 m. 9 the vertical bracket to the right of the figures in staves 2-4 shows that the two parallel eighth-note figures, both of which are beamed between two staves (e-f-d in staves 2-3 and g-a-g in staves 3-4), are also drawn from CI and that collectively these pitches form a 5-10 CI set. The fact that both of these three-note figures span two staves probably indicates that m. 9 staff 3 is to be read as a dual-clef measure; i.e., the note after the eighth rest is g, but the two following are f and d. The two figures might be parallel, as they have been more simply rendered in Example 4.36, or the lower figure might have been intended to replace the upper one. In either case the pitches in this tetrachordal figure duplicate pcs in the vocal line, but in order to keep the examples as simple as possible, they have not been beamed to the vocal set in Examples 4.35 and 4.36. Finally, as Example 4.36 demonstrates, on the downbeat of m. 9 the f and c of staff 3, the a of staff 4, and the cello dyad of staff 5 might be combined to form a 5-31 CII pc set, thus neatly accounting for every pitch in m. 9 as part of either the CI or CII collection. In m. 9 Webern seems to have been working primarily with two of the three octatonic collections.

188 In Example 4.36 the figures have been condensed into as few staves as possible to enhance clarity and reduce the size of the example. The two eighth-note figures that cross staves 2-3 and 3-4 in m. 9 of Example 4.34 and 4.35 have been condensed into staff 2. Also the heavily circled a-f-d<2-d2 tetrachord in m. 10 staff 4 has been eliminated from Example 4.36, since it duplicates pitches in staff 2. Comparison with the transcription in Example 4.34 should clarify the changes made.
In the CI context of the vocal line in mm. 8-10, the $c^2$ on “vor” emerges as a dissonance that might challenge an octatonic analysis of the melody until the composer’s intentions become clear on the downbeat of m. 10. As Examples 4.35 and 4.36 show, the $g<^1$, as well as the previous crossed-out $b$, concludes the second vocal phrase into a 7-31 CII pc set, thus resolving the dissonance of the vocal line into the same octatonic collection as the CII bass dyad played by the cello in m. 9. The 7-31 CII pc set of m. 10 staff 2 lacks only pc $C$ to make up the complete collection, the same pc that emerged as a dissonance in the previous vocal line. Another pc $C$ is provided by the harp in staff 5 on the second half of beat 1, and yet another ($c^2$) sounds as the first pitch of the 4-3 CIII pc set in staff 6. A number of circled but still legible figures in m. 10, such as the $f^1-c<^1-c^1-b$ melody of staff 3 and the $a-f^1-d<^2$ and $d^2$ of staff 4 (shown circled in Example 4.34, in alternate notation in Example 4.35, and omitted from Example 4.36), reveal that Webern

---

189 Pitch classes $E=$ and $B$ coexist only in CII.
sketched a variety of instrumental alternatives in this measure, all of which duplicate pcs in the figures of the uppermost layer; pcs C C< E= and E appear in staves 2, 5 and 6. The fact that so many layers are still visible suggests that this measure may not have been finished, and certainly it is at this point that the sketch begins to degenerate rapidly.

The extremely light hand, overlapping revisions, and repetitive figures in m. 10 suggest that the composer’s ideas for the short instrumental interlude between vocal phrases 2 and 3 are tentative and incomplete, yet an octatonic pattern is clear. After the strong cadence into CII on the downbeat of m. 10, two 4-3 CIII figures occur on beats 2 and 3, as shown in staves 2 and 6 of Example 4.35. The a¹ and g² eighth-notes of staff 3 and the C-E-e=/c<₁ ninth-notes of staff 5 are also all elements of CIII. Collectively these figures comprise a CIII set that is missing only pc F< from the complete collection, and this pc appears as the f<₁ setting the first syllable of “lange” on the downbeat of m. 11.¹⁹¹ In contrast to the second phrase of the poem, the vocal setting of the third poetic line, “und lange hatt’ ich’s nicht gedacht,” is octatonically “pure,” providing a 5-10 CIII pc set. Example 4.36 shows that the vocal line could be combined with the first trichord in the accompaniment, a 3-3 set, to create a 7-31 CIII pc set that omits only the pc E=, the first pitch of the next vocal phrase. The other chords and figures that accompany this octatonic, if repetitive (two f<₁ and three a¹), vocal line are also clearly octatonic. The second trichord in m. 11 staff 2 is another 3-3 set, this one from CII, and staves 3-5 and 6-7 of Example 4.36 contain what appear to be two versions of roughly the same CI collection.¹⁹²

¹⁹⁰In the manuscript in m. 10 staff 5 upbeat 3 Webern notated the pitch c<. This note appears in alternate notation in all examples because he then wrote “es” (pc E=) above this note.

¹⁹¹Without the g² at the end of m. 10 staff 3 the CIII set of m. 10 would be missing the same two pcs (G and F<) that set the first two words of the third vocal phrase. It is unlikely that Webern ultimately would have doubled the g¹ on “und” (end of m. 10) at the octave, as appears in m. 10.

¹⁹²The trichord in m. 11 staff 3 was originally written as c<²-e²-b². The b² has a small h (pc B>) written to the left of it, but then the whole figure was circled. Webern wrote
The final line of the poem’s first stanza is set to a melody the first four pitches of which (e\(\sharp\)-f\(\flat\)-e\(\sharp\)-f\(\flat\) in mm. 12-14) are decidedly chromatic, although the chromatic melody is accompanied by two octatonic trichords in staff 2, a 3-3 CI and a 3-5 CII. Both of these trichords are aligned with pitches in staff 3, A and B\(\flat\), that do not share the same octatonic collection. The last four syllables of the vocal line are set to a 4-18 CII set, the same pc set found at the beginning and end of the glockenspiel solo of mm. 1-5. The linear 4-18 CII sets of mm. 1 and 14-15 share pc E\(\flat\) and the pitch f\(\flat\), found at both the beginning and end of the sketch.

As mentioned at the beginning of this analysis, “Flieder” sketch 103-0791 provides an indisputable example of Webern creating atonal music through the manipulation of octatonic sets. In some phrases the composer wedded the basic concept of aggregate phrasing with the use of octatonic sets, so that the appearance of the last pc of an 8-28 set marks a sectional division in the work. For example, the first two pitches of the vocal line in mm. 5-6 not only complete the sketch’s first aggregate, but they also provide the pcs missing from the 6-Z50 CII set on the downbeat of m. 5. Similarly, the CII set of the vocal melody in mm. 5-8 is not complete until the phrase’s final word. On another level the octatonic sets also serve a harmonic function. For example, although the introductory glockenspiel solo contains subsets of all three octatonic collections, the solo is constructed in a manner that clearly emphasizes CII, thus setting up the sonority of the first vocal phrase. In the second vocal phrase, mm. 8-10, the composer exploited the relationship of only two octatonic collections. In m. 9 he introduced a dissonance, c\(\sharp\), within an otherwise clearly CI vocal line and then resolved this dissonance into a collection (CII) that was foreshadowed both by the dissonant vocal note and the dyad in “cis-e-b” (pcs C\(<\)-E-B\(\flat\)) to the left of the trichord. The letter notation appears to be the final layer, so these are the notes included in Examples 4.34, 4.35 and 4.36.

\(^{193}\)I assume that m. 13 staff 3 is a bass clef measure, despite the fact that the figure before it (m. 12) is obviously in treble clef; otherwise, the figure in m. 12 ends on E\(<\). If m. 13 staff 3 is bass clef, Webern scratched out the d and replaced it with A, because the d doubled the d\(\flat\) in the trichord above. Also, if m. 13 staff 3 was in treble clef, the g\(\flat\) would be enharmonic with the f\(\flat\) of the trichord above.
the bass. In the instrumental interlude that follows (m. 10) the 7-31 CIII pc set on beats 2 and 3 prepares the CIII octatonic sonority that is the foundation of the third vocal phrase. Given the incompleteness of the final measures, we cannot know how Webern may have completed the setting of the poem’s first stanza, but it is possible that he sought to conclude with a return to the CII sonority that played such an important role at the beginning of the piece.\footnote{It is interesting to observe that the fourth vocal phrase begins with a four-pitch linear set (pcs E = E F F< in normal order) that is not octatonic, yet in any such set two octatonic sets will contain three of those pitches; CII contains pcs E = F and F<, and CII contains E = E and F<. Given that the 3-3 CII pc set of m. 11 staff 2 emerges as a dissonance in that otherwise CIII context, and the fact that the last four pitches of the fourth vocal line form a 4-18 CII set, Webern may have intended the 3-3 set of m. 11 to forecast the octatonic orientation of the fourth melody line, which in turn also contains some dissonant elements, pcs E and C<, to be resolved. CIII contains pcs E and C<, as well as the vocal line’s final pc, F<, so a cadence in this collection would resolve the dissonance. Neither of the trichords that underlies the fourth vocal line in m. 13 is drawn from CIII, however. However stimulating for an enthusiast, speculation in this regard is almost pointless, of course, because it is very possible and even likely that Webern would have revised every part, including the vocal line, if he had continued the sketch.}

**PSS 103-0790**

“Flieder” manuscript 103-0790 is a single-page, fragmentary pencil sketch, comprising slightly more than 10 measures of music for soprano voice, ranging from b-2 to a-2, and the following 13 instruments: flute, B= clarinet, E= clarinet, trumpet, trombone, celesta, glockenspiel, harp, bass drum, violin, viola, cello, and double bass.\footnote{The verso of 103-0790 is blank except for an ink vertical line on the left, which connects the top five staves into a system, and the words “Primus Viol” and “Secundus,” also in black ink, in the left margin beside staves 1 and 2, respectively.} Sketch page 103-0790 is an eleven-stave, oblong-format half-sheet torn on the left and bottom edges. There is no paper manufacturer’s stamp on either side of the sheet. The page is darker brown than most, and it is also a little dirty and smudged. The page is divided into two systems of five staves each (staves 1-5 and 7-11), although the middle staff (staff 6) contains revisions for both the system above and below it. Unpitched vocal
declamation rhythms appear above the vocal staff in several measures. The indecisive date “1920 oder 1921” was written by the composer in the upper left corner of the page. Although it sets no more text than do the other three “Flieder” manuscripts, this sketch preserves the most complete conception of the song. The notation of the first 6 measures is very clean and clear, despite some revisions, and the music is enhanced with detailed expressive markings and orchestration. The manuscript looks very much like the beginning of a continuity draft and even includes one Hauptstimme symbol (m. 3 between staves 3 and 4), but the sketch lacks two defining features of Webern’s continuity drafts: it does not set the whole poem, and it was not end-dated by the composer. After m. 7 the instrumental abbreviations begin to disappear, and the revisions increase substantially, resulting in several measures that cannot be reliably interpreted. Still, despite the ambiguities in the final measures, with this manuscript Webern achieved a fairly complete setting of the first stanza of Kraus’s poem. The fact that this sketch is so detailed and completely sets a major portion of the poem must be two reasons that compelled the Moldenhauers to include “Flieder” along with “Vallorbe,” M. 232, and “Vision des Erblindeten,” M. 236, in the unpublished Three Kraus Songs, despite the fact it is unlike the others in that M. 232 and M. 236 both exist in complete continuity drafts. It must be noted, however, that the 103-0790 version of “Flieder” does not end in a definitive final gesture or cadence, and the composer’s intentions for the vocal setting of the first stanza’s final line are difficult to interpret. A performance edition of this partial “Flieder” setting could be created, but it would require substantial composition by the editor and could only result in an edition that is less authentic than those that might be created for “Vallorbe” or “Vision des Erblindeten.”

Example 4.37 provides a transcription of the final layer of “Flieder” sketch 103-0790. Although the musical surface of 103-0790 is very different from that of the other manuscripts...
Example 4.37: “Flieder,” M. 246, PSS 103-0790, transcription of final layer
“Flieder” sketches, like 103-0791 the 103-0790 version of “Flieder” begins with several musical gestures that suggest an octatonic origin. These octatonic subsets are graphically presented in Example 4.38 along with a few other interesting non-octatonic sets. As in the 103-0791 sketch of “Flieder,” a large octatonic subset is formed by the vocal setting of the poem’s first line, although in the case of 103-0790 the vocal motive is not octatonically pure—i.e., neither of the octatonic subsets shown in Example 4.38 can account for the entire vocal melody in mm. 1-3.\textsuperscript{198} Measures 1 and 2 of Examples 4.37 and 4.38 include two pitches on each of the first three syllables of the vocal line because it cannot be determined which of the pitches represent the final layer of revisions; in the manuscript both pitches on “Nun” (b\textsuperscript{1} and g\textsuperscript{1}) are circled and none of the pitches of “weiß ich” is scratched out, circled, or overwritten. The beaming in m. 2 (reproduced in Example 4.37) does, however, indicate that the a\textsuperscript{1} and f<\textsuperscript{1} were written together, as were the b\textsuperscript{1} and g<\textsuperscript{1}, and the placement of the text shows that the first three syllables were set to g\textsuperscript{1}-a\textsuperscript{1}-f<\textsuperscript{1} at some point. The hypothetical vocal line that sets the first three words to g\textsuperscript{1}-a\textsuperscript{1}-f<\textsuperscript{1} creates a contiguous 7-31 CIII pc set (pcs E F< G A B= C D= in normal order), omitting only pc E= from that collection. This octatonic subset does not, however, account for the vocal line’s final pitch, the d\textsuperscript{1} on the second syllable of “wieder.” The other possible 7-31 set in the vocal line, this one from CI (pcs G G< B= B C< D E), is less convincing, for it does not consist of contiguous pitches and cannot account for the c\textsuperscript{2} that sets the first syllable of “Frühling.”

None of the later vocal lines offers a purely octatonic set either, although the third vocal phrase is somewhat similar to the first. In mm. 6-8 the third vocal phrase is very repetitive, comprising only five different pitches in the eight-syllable phrase (three e\textsuperscript{1} and two e=\textsuperscript{1}). Like the first vocal phrase, the third can be interpreted in part as a subset of CIII (4-12 pc set) that again cannot account for the pitch d\textsuperscript{1}. The third vocal phrase certainly does not sound octatonic, however, especially given the e\textsuperscript{1}-e=\textsuperscript{1}-d\textsuperscript{1}-c<\textsuperscript{1} chromatic descent that concludes the phrase. The second and fourth vocal phrases are less

\textsuperscript{198}The first aggregate in this sketch is complete in m. 2 on the a\textsuperscript{1} that sets the second vocal syllable “weiß.”
Example 4.38: “Flieder,” M. 246, PSS 103-0790, octatonic and select other sets
octatonic, even conspicuously chromatic, as in the setting of “Ich sah es vor so viel Nacht” in mm. 4-6, which contains the pcs B C C< D E= E F and G in normal order. The fourth vocal phrase begins with a 4-3 CII set, but again the complete line comprises a largely chromatic set, pcs G A= A B= B C D E in normal order.\(^{199}\) An abrupt reduction of purely octatonic linear figures after the initial measures is a feature shared by “Flieder” sketches 103-0791 and 103-0790, but in 103-0790 not even the first vocal phrase is octatonic in its entirety, raising the possibility that the octatonic subsets in that sketch are coincidental.

The most convincing octatonic subsets in “Flieder” sketch 103-0790 are found among the instrumental figures. For example, the muted and largely pizzicato violin gesture of m. 1 comprises six pitches (a 6-27 pc set, pcs D E= F F< A= B) from CII, omitting only pcs C and A from the complete collection. Thus, unlike every logical subdivision of the vocal line, in m. 1 a single octatonic subset accounts for the entire violin figure. This prominent violin gesture is rhythmically related to the subsequent thirty-second note figures in m. 2 staves 3 and 4, which are also largely octatonic.\(^{200}\) The thirty-second notes in the muted trumpet and E=-clarinet lines of m. 2 (staff 3) can be combined to create a 6-Z49 CI pc set (pcs B B< G< G E D), again omitting only two pitches (pcs C< and F) from the collection.\(^{201}\) In Example 4.38 the 6-Z49 set is beamed

\(^{199}\)The vocal setting of “Nun merk ich erst, schon blüht der Flieder” in Examples 4.37 and 4.38 was written in the manuscript in staff 6, above the staff (staff 7) that contains the vocal line after m. 6 (system 2, mm. 7-10). Above the final two notes, b= -a\(^1\), is scribbled something that appears to be “B is begl.” The “B” probably refers to the b= on “Flie[der], and the “is” might be the beginning of “ist,” although no “t” is visible. The meaning of this inscription remains unknown.

\(^{200}\)Among the voices moving as thirty-second notes in m. 2 staves 3 and 4, the first interval in lines 1 (b\(^1\)-d\(^2\)) and 4 (g< -f) is ic 3; the second interval of all four parts is ic 4. This same sequence of intervals occurs immediately prior to this in the vocal line, in the a\(^1\)-f< -b= -1 setting of “weiß ich doch.”

\(^{201}\)Although the notation is easily legible in the manuscript, the composer wrote “g” and “gis” beneath the E=-clarinet line to clarify the first and second pitches, as seen in Example 4.37.
The last beat (last eighth-note in 3/8 time) of m. 3 staff 3 was heavily revised, scratched out, and overwritten, but it appears that an earlier layer contained a $a^\sharp - e^\natural - g<^\natural$ as sixteenth-note triplets, revealing that pc A was part of this melodic line from an early stage. Webern probably replaced the $d^\natural$ in m. 3 and replaced it with $a^\natural$, a pc that is not in CI, thereby once again contaminating the octatonic purity of the melodic line.\footnote{The last beat (last eighth-note in 3/8 time) of m. 3 staff 3 was heavily revised, scratched out, and overwritten, but it appears that an earlier layer contained $a^\natural - e^\natural - g<^\natural$ as sixteenth-note triplets, revealing that pc A was part of this melodic line from an early stage. Webern probably replaced the $d^\natural$ with $a^\natural$ after deleting the $a^\natural - e^\natural - g<^\natural$ triplet. The $b^\natural - g^\natural - g<^\natural$ sixteenth-note triplet included in Examples 4.37 and 4.38 was also scratched out in the manuscript, but the letter notation “b g gis” above the staff reinserted it.} With the inclusion of the pc $D^\natural$, the CI set of m. 2 staff 3 is missing only pc $F$ from the collection, which raises a question as to the clef in m. 3 staff 5. Also of interest in this regard is the dotted line that the composer drew to connect the final $e^\natural$ thirty-second note of m. 2 staff 3 to the uppermost pitch on the downbeat of m. 3 staff 5. This dotted line has been included in Examples 4.37 and 4.38. There is no clef in the fifth staff, and the fact that the violin figure in m. 1 staff 5 is clearly in treble clef is of little consequence for m. 3. In m. 3 staff 5 the dotted-quarter note on the first ledger line below the staff recommends a bass clef reading, for Webern would not have notated $C^\natural$ without a clear purpose, yet if the eighth-note on the staff’s top line is $f^\natural$, then the dotted line that leads from the $E^\natural$-clarinet’s $e^\natural$ of m. 2 would point to the missing pc of CI. This dotted line could merely indicate voice leading—the melodic line of m. 3 staff 5 is marked “Klar” and is probably a continuation of the $E^\natural$-clarinet’s line—but it might also reveal an intentional octatonic compositional strategy. Instances of “dual clefs” within a single measure can be found in Webern’s sketches, such as that discussed in relation to m. 9 of 103-0791; this sketch appears to represent another.\footnote{The composer probably would not have left two pc $F$ on the downbeat of m. 4 (staves 4 and 5), as seen in Examples 4.37 and 4.38, and the clarinet line of staff 5 probably supersedes at least the $f^\flat$ of staff 4. It was apparently important to have a pc $F$ on the downbeat of m. 4, for an indistinctly notated and circled figure on the downbeat of m. 4 staff 4 (eighth-notes $f^\flat - d^\natural - e^\natural$ marked “Cello”), not included in Examples 4.37 or 4.38, provided yet a third, and there is also a small looped symbol jotted above the treble clef of m. 4 staff 4 (included in Example 4.37) that looks like the letter $f$.} “Fließer” sketch 103-0791 also provided prior evidence that the...
composer occasionally used supplementary lines to group octatonic sets on the sketch page. Furthermore, if m. 3 staff 5 is a dual-clef measure, the composer may have conceived of the low E= in that measure as the missing pc from the CIII octatonic set of the first vocal phrase.

The combined instrumental lines of m. 2 staff 4, also thirty-second note figures, are less clearly octatonic than those of m. 2 staff 3, for although five of the pitches form a 5-28 CII pc set (pcs E= F G< A B), the viola’s initial c< is not part of that collection.204 The pizzicato viola line of m. 2 (c<1-e=1-b), a 3-6 pc set, is in fact the only linear trichord among these four thirty-second note figures of m. 2 that is not a 3-3 pc set, a very prevalent motive in this sketch.205

The motive of linear 3-3 pc sets was first modeled by the E= -clarinet figure in m. 0, where g-f<1-b=1, a 3-3 CIII pc set, emerged as the first three pitches of the piece. The introductory E= -clarinet line can be expanded to a 4-Z15 CIII pc set, if the trill’s upper neighbor, c3 (specified in the manuscript by a > in parentheses), is included with the first three notes,206 but the trill’s principal note, b2, is not a member of that octatonic collection.207 Three more linear 3-3 pc sets appear among adjacent pitches in the m. 1 violin figure, excluding the initial a=, and these 3-3 sets interlock one another as

---

204 It is impossible to determine via manuscript evidence whether there is a connection between the “odd” c< in m. 2 staff 4 and the deleted d=2 in m. 3 staff 3—i.e., whether the composer erased the d=2 with the intention of allowing the c< to complete the CI octatonic collection of mm. 2-3 staff 3—but the coincidence is interesting.

205 The viola figure of m. 2 staff 4 appears as seen in Examples 4.37; i.e., the first two notes (c<1 and e=1) are not repeated as in the other three instruments, although there is a stem for the second, unwritten c<1 (also included in Example 4.37). The absence of these notes is probably just an omission on the composer’s part.

206 The two notes of the trill in m. 1 staff 2 are shown as a unison in Example 4.38, in order to beam the upper neighbor (c3) with the other members of the 4-Z15 set.

207 As Example 4.38 shows, the opening E= -clarinet motive forms a non-octatonic 4-7 pc set (labeled beneath the figure) if the upper neighbor of the trill (pc C) is discounted. In mm. 4 and 5 this 4-7 pc set is transformed into the vertical tetrachords labeled in the example by vertical brackets.
demonstrated by the brackets above the figure in Example 4.38. 3-3 pc sets next occur in the first four pitches of the vocal line, setting “Nun weiß ich doch,” provided that the b=1 on “Nun” is grouped with a1-f<1 or the g1 with b1-g<1. If the first four vocal pitches are b=1-a1-f<1-b=, then the vocal phrase also begins with two interlocking 3-3 pc sets, as is illustrated in Example 4.38 by the horizontal brackets above and below the vocal line. Severing the g1 from the following a1-f<1 contradicts the pitch groupings (g1-a1-f<1 and b=1-b1-g<1, both 3-2 sets) and the sequence of revisions suggested by the beaming of notes and positioning of text, but it would not negate the CIII octatonic subset found in the melody’s first eight pitches. The resulting vocal melody would be missing pcs G and E= from the complete CIII collection, reducing the set from a 7-31 to a 6-Z49 CIII set (pcs A B= C C< E F<), which still cannot account for the melody’s final d1. Such an analysis may seem convoluted and conveniently reductive, but it is conceivable that Webern was attempting to revise the vocal line to establish these motivic relationships. Finding the task to be somewhat difficult, perhaps he simply moved on for the moment and left two layers of options for later consideration. A strikingly similar pattern of interlocking 3-3 sets occurs later in the same vocal phrase, mm. 2-3, where again the repeat of a pc at the octave (b=1 and b= in mm. 1-2 and d=1 and c<2 in mm. 2-3) frames a pair of interlocking 3-3 sets. This prevalent motivic pattern continues in the two instrumental figures of m. 2 staff 3, each of which forms a linear 3-3 pc set (b1-d2-b=1 and g1-g<1-e1, respectively). The earlier version of the trumpet line (top voice), which included d=2 in m. 3, also contained a second 3-3 set (d2-b=1-d=2) that again interlocked with the first. Finally, if the E= -clarinet line does end on f2 on the downbeat of m. 3 staff 5, then the resulting g<1-e1-f2 line is yet another 3-3 set that interlocks with the previous

208 If the vocal line began g1-b1-g<1 the vocal set in mm. 1-3 would be a largely chromatic 8-12 pc set (pcs G G< B= B C C< D E in normal order).

209 The upper melodic line of staff 3 mm. 2-3 also comprised a 6-Z49 set of a different octatonic collection, CI, before the deletion of the d=2 in m. 3.
Other 3-3 sets, not labeled but illustrated by horizontal brackets in Example 4.38, include several occurrences of the pcs E\(=\)E-G: the first three vocal pitches of m. 5, the first six vocal pitches of the poems’ third line in mm. 6-7 (“und lange hatt ich nicht [gedacht]”), the first three pitches of m. 6 staff 3 (probably in the clarinet), and the last three pitches of the unorchestrated figure in m. 9 staff 5. In the last instance Webern may have intended to replace the e\(^2\) with pc G\(<\), as indicated by “gis” above the staff (included in Example 4.37). There are also interlocking 3-3 sets in mm. 5-10, such as those seen in the instrumental melody of mm. 5-6 staff 3 and the vocal melody of mm. 6-7. Another 3-3 set is formed in mm. 8-9 by the first three pitches of the fourth vocal phrase.

210 Other 3-3 sets, not labeled but illustrated by horizontal brackets in Example 4.38, include several occurrences of the pcs E\(=\)E-G: the first three vocal pitches of m. 5, the first six vocal pitches of the poems’ third line in mm. 6-7 (“und lange hatt ich nicht [gedacht]”), the first three pitches of m. 6 staff 3 (probably in the clarinet), and the last three pitches of the unorchestrated figure in m. 9 staff 5. In the last instance Webern may have intended to replace the e\(^2\) with pc G\(<\), as indicated by “gis” above the staff (included in Example 4.37). There are also interlocking 3-3 sets in mm. 5-10, such as those seen in the instrumental melody of mm. 5-6 staff 3 and the vocal melody of mm. 6-7. Another 3-3 set is formed in mm. 8-9 by the first three pitches of the fourth vocal phrase.

211 In an earlier layer the third note of the flute line m. 2 (a\(^2\)) was a g\(^2\) with no visible accidental. The flute pitch would have to be g\(<^2\) to form the same interval pattern.

212 The three sixteenth notes of m. 3 staff 2 have double dots either above or below them, probably indicating pairs of thirty-second notes as in m. 2 staves 3 and 4.
the flute (staff 2) and harp (staff 6) countermelodies of mm. 2-4. As Example 4.38 shows, the 6-27 CIII pc set formed by the instrumental melody of m. 5-6 staff 3 is the only large octatonic subset to be found in the later measures, and even in that instance the octatonic analysis cannot account for the a=1 at the end of m. 5. The later measures of the sketch are most characterized by the largely semitonal movement of the instrumental lines in mm. 6-8 staves 2 and 4. The lower line of mm. 6-9 staff 4 comprises the pcs B C< D E= E F, and the parallel upper melody in the same staff comprises pcs A B= B C C<. In staff 2 of the same measures the lower instrumental melody comprises pcs F F< G G< and the parallel line above it contains pcs A B= B C C< D. Although octatonic subsets, like the 6-27 CIII of mm. 5-6, could be formed by eliminating certain pitches, when taken as a whole most of these instrumental lines are more-or-less strictly chromatic.

“Mutig trägst du die Last,” M. 211

Manuscript descriptions

The last Kraus text that Webern set to music is the elegiac poem "Mutig trägst du die Last," the settings of which are cataloged as M. 211. The compositional materials for Webern’s settings of this poem are found in three one-page, loose-leaf pencil sketches, now archived in the Webern Collection of the PSS. All three sketches are fragmentary; two provide enough music to set only the first line of the poem (half of the first couplet), and the third sketch was abandoned after setting the first of the poem’s three couplets. The Moldenhauers were aware of only two of the sketches (103-0807 and 103-0808), and, as in the case of “In tiefster Schuld” (M. 210), they did not identify the poem’s

213 In measure 4 staff 2 the f^{3}<c^{3}<f^{3}<b^{2}=^{2}g^{2} figure in the glockenspiel occurs amid a jumble of overlapping revisions, and therefore my transcription of the figure is not certain. If my reading of the final layer is accurate, then this figure could be one of two tetrachordal octatonic subsets, a 4-23 (f^{3}<c^{3}<b^{2}=^{2}g^{2}) without the pc F< or a 4-Z15 (c^{3}<f^{3}<b^{2}=^{2}g^{2}) without the pc F.
Neither of the sketches described by the Moldenhauers was dated by the composer. The Works List of Moldenhauer’s Webern biography provides a *terminus post quem* of “1914 or later.” The PSS catalog dates the sketches as “between 1922 and 1924?” although the folder containing the original manuscripts of 103-0807 and 103-0808 also holds a thin leaf on which the date “ca. 1917-1920” is written in Rosaleen Moldenhauer’s handwriting. This approximate date would place Webern’s settings of “Mutig” within the same time-frame of his other Kraus settings, all of which were initiated between 1916 and 1920, but, in fact, as many as four years may have elapsed between Webern’s last attempts to set “Flieder,” M. 246, in 1920 and his sketches on “Mutig.” The approximate date of 1924 for the M. 211 sketches is deduced from the date of a third M. 211 sketch, which was unknown to the Moldenhauers. This fragmentary sketch, the earliest of the three, appears on the recto side of a folio that also contains a preliminary pencil sketch of “Armer Sünder, du,” op. 17 no. 1, on its verso. The sketches of “Armer Sünder, du” are end-dated 10 December 1924 in the composer’s

---

214 For Moldenhauer’s description of “Mutig” manuscripts 103-0807 and 103-0808, see *Chronicle*, 277. According to Shreffler, Felix Meyer identified Karl Kraus as the author of “Mutig” some time before 1994; see Shreffler, “‘Mein Weg geht jetzt vorüber’: The Vocal Origins of Webern’s Twelve-Tone Composition,” 321 n. 67.

“Mutig” first appeared under the title "An eine Heilige" (To a Saint) in *Die Fackel* no. 588-94 (March 1922): 54. The poem also appeared in the sixth volume of *Worte in Versen*, also published in 1922.


217 Rosaleen Moldenhauer also wrote the first couplet of the poem (as much as appears in 103-0808) and the manuscript number (M. 211) on this leaf. Many of the folders in the PSS Webern Collection contain these small, thin pages on which Rosaleen Moldenhauer wrote archival information.

218 This recently acquired sketch of M. 211 had not been microfilmed as of fall 1997. The folder containing this sketch is identified as "Op. 17, Drei Volkstexte / Skizzen / Mutig trägst du die Last (M. 211) / Skizzen / Nouveau." Hereafter, this sketch of M. 211 will be referred to as the “nouveau” sketch.
Sketches for “Armer Sünder, du” actually appear on both sides of the page. On the recto side the setting of the traditional poem appears on the lower staves, beneath the sketches of “Mutig,” suggesting that the M. 211 sketches are the earlier. Therefore, the date of 10 December 1924 for the “Armer Sünder, du” sketch represents the terminus ante quem for the creation of the earliest “Mutig” sketch.

Context

Webern composed relatively little between spring 1922 and winter 1924. Shreffler has suggested that the composer’s previous compositional fluency was interrupted during or before the summer 1922 by exposure to Schoenberg’s method of twelve-tone composition, a revelation that “required a major rethinking of his compositional habits and seriously disrupted what had been a reasonably steady flow of work.”

The only new works that Webern successfully completed during this period were the second and fourth songs of the Five Sacred Songs, op. 15, and the Five Canons, op. 16, none of which is a dodecaphonic work. The unpublished sketches from this period, however, reveal that Webern was experimenting with row composition as early as the summer of 1922. His preliminary pencil sketches on the chorale text

---

219 This sketch of “Armer Sünder, du” is the earliest of five extant pencil sketches of the song. The verso side of the nouveau sketch provides an entire setting of “Armer Sünder, du” on three staff systems of condensed score. The upper layers of revision are similar to the published version, yet the sketch preserves many interesting differences. Staves 13 through 22 (counting from the top) of the recto side contain further revisions of the song’s last seven measures (mm. 10-16). For a more complete discussion of the pencil sketches of op. 17 no. 1, see Donna Levern Lynn, “Genesis, Process, and Reception of Anton Webern’s Twelve-Tone Music; A Study of the Sketches for Opp. 17-19, 21, and 22 no. 2 (1924-1930)” (Ph.D. diss., Duke University, 1992), 79-86.

220 Shreffler, “Mein Weg geht jetzt vorüber,” 278.

221 The first and third songs of op. 15 were finished in 1921, and the fifth song, “Fahr hin, o Seel” (at one time grouped with the op. 13 songs), was completed in 1917.

222 Webern also prepared piano-voice reductions of opp. 14 and 15 during 1923 and of op. 13 in February 1924.
“Mein Weg geht jetzt vorüber” (later published as op. 15 no. 4) bear Webern’s earliest row sketches. In these sketches the row is manipulated in transposition, inversion, retrograde, and retrograde inversion, demonstrating that he understood the basic tenets of twelve-tone technique well before Schoenberg’s formal announcement at the famous meeting of February 1923. Webern soon rejected the twelve-tone approach to “Mein Weg geht jetzt vorüber” and completed the piece in a style that transfers elements of the original row into his earlier free atonal idiom. After this initial failure at composing with ordered tone rows Webern did not return to this method until the fall and winter of 1924, when he successfully completed his first twelve-tone serial compositions, the piano piece Kinderstück, M. 267, and the song “Armer Sünder, du,” op. 17 no. 1, each of which is based on a single twelve-tone row, and the latter of which was initially sketched on the verso of the earliest “Mutig” manuscripts. Clearly, Webern’s settings of “Mutig” originated in the midst of his experiments with and new acquisition of twelve-tone technique.

---

223 For a thorough discussion of these sketches and their contents, see Shreffler, “Mein Weg geht jetzt vorüber,” 288-301.

224 The Kinderstück, M. 267, was composed in response to a request by Emil Hertzka of Universal Edition for a cycle of children’s piano pieces, but the piece was not published in Webern’s lifetime; see Moldenhauer, Chronicle, 312. The Moldenhauers discovered an ink fair copy of the piece in 1965, and it was published by Carl Fischer in 1966. See Raymond Ericson, “New Webern Haul Found in a Dark Attic,” New York Times, Sunday, 10 April 1966, section X, p. 11. No sketches for the completed Kinderstück survive; there is, however, a sketch for another serially organized children’s piece (M. 266) that Webern did not finish. Detailed descriptions of both M. 266 and M. 267 are provided in Shreffler, “Mein Weg geht jetzt vorüber,” 309-12.

According to Shreffler, Webern offered the set of Three Traditional Rhymes (later published as op. 17) to Universal Edition for publication in at least three letters to Hertzka in 1926 and 1927 (photocopies in the PSS), but they were not published as a set in his lifetime. See Shreffler, “Mein Weg geht vorüber,” 312 n. 55. For a discussion of the early manuscripts and twelve-tone origins of “Armer Sunder du,” op. 17 no. 1, see Moldenhauer, Chronicle, 313.
While the instrumental abbreviation looks most like “har” (harmonium), Webern usually writes harmonium parts on a grand staff, as is seen in 103-0807. The indication is most likely “hor” (horn), an instrument that appears in all three instrumentation lists at the top of the page. Shreffler lists the instruments in the nouveau sketch as clarinet, violin, horn, and cello, but all of these instruments appear in the second sketch on this page, so it is unclear whether or not she considered the textless instrumental introduction to be related to “Mutig.” See Shreffler, “Mein Weg geht jetzt vorüber,” 337.

“Nouveau” Sketch

The earliest sketch of “Mutig” is a single-page, fragmentary pencil sketch, comprising approximately 11 measures of music. This sketch was written on a 22-stave, oblong format half-sheet. Viewed from the side with the M. 211 sketch, the page has been torn from its bifolio on the left edge and torn into a half sheet at the top, leaving margins at right and bottom. This page is in particularly poor condition; it is browning and dirty, and a worn crease divides the page in half vertically. The sheet is raggedly torn around its edges, possibly because it is larger (38.4 x 28.4 cm) than most of the small half- and quarter-sheets that Webern used for sketching. The paper manufacturer’s stamp appears in the lower left corner: J. E. & Co., Depose, 42-staff. These 11 measures, which encapsulate two different attempts to set the poem, are written in condensed score on two separate, four-stave systems. The first attempt is nothing more than a three-measure instrumental introduction (the first measure of which contains only an eighth-note pickup), reproduced in Example 4.39. The abbreviated instrumental indications used in this introduction are “cello” and another that is unclear—it may be “hor” (French horn, an abbreviation that appears in the second M. 211 sketch on this page), “har” (harmonium, an instrument used in “Mutig” manuscript 103-0808), or, least likely, “klar” (clarinet, an instrument that also appears at the beginning of the second nouveau sketch, but which is there abbreviated as “Kl”). Since no text appears in this brief sketch, it would be unidentifiable as a song fragment, if it were not for the empty upper staff that reserved for the vocal line. Like dozens of other abandoned instrumental song introductions found in Webern’s sketches, the poem that inspired this introduction would be impossible to determine, if it were not for the text included in the second setting on the same page.

225While the instrumental abbreviation looks most like “har” (harmonium), Webern usually writes harmonium parts on a grand staff, as is seen in 103-0807. The indication is most likely “hor” (horn), an instrument that appears in all three instrumentation lists at the top of the page. Shreffler lists the instruments in the nouveau sketch as clarinet, violin, horn, and cello, but all of these instruments appear in the second sketch on this page, so it is unclear whether or not she considered the textless instrumental introduction to be related to “Mutig.” See Shreffler, “Mein Weg geht jetzt vorüber,” 337.
Example 4.39: “Mutig,” M. 211, Nouveau sketch, system 1

The second nouveau sketch of “Mutig” also contains a three-measure instrumental introduction, but then the sketch continues with three more measures of the vocal line. The instruments called for in this sketch are clarinet, violin, horn, and cello. The first eleven words of the poem are set, constituting the first line of the poem’s first couplet. After the sixth measure (the ninth measure on the page, counting the abandoned instrumental introduction) the sketch degenerates into two final measures of non-pitched rhythmic notation written above the staff of the vocal line. These rhythmic figures complete the declamation of the first couplet. Webern apparently abandoned the sketch at this point, for he never went back to sketch in the instrumental parts that would accompany the vocal line. A transcription of the second nouveau sketch of “Mutig” is provided as Example 4.40.

The fact that these two sketches appear on the same page certainly does not indicate automatically that they are related to the same text. Webern often sketched several different pieces on a single sheet, as is evidenced by nouveau sketch page itself, which contains sketches for both M. 211 and op. 17 no. 1. The musical material of
It may be that the composer intended the sixteenth-note e\(^1\) in m. 2 (second note of the measure) to retain the accidental of the previous e\(^=1\). The immediate repetition of pitches is a characteristic of Webern’s early experiments with ordered and unordered tone rows, so this is a strong possibility. There are several instances of pitch repetition in the other settings of M. 211, sometimes involving E\(=\) (see the discussion of 103-0807), and Webern typically did not rewrite the accidental. Measure 8 of the nouveau sketch provides a similar example, this time with c\(<^1\) and, once again, e\(^=2\).

Example 4.40: “Mutig,” M. 211, Nouveau sketch, second system, diplomatic transcription

the sketches, however, suggests that the two fragments are related, despite the fact that the musical surfaces of the two sketches appear quite different. Beyond the shared 3/4 meter, the rhythm of mm. 3 and 5, both occurring in the second full measure of their respective entries, is the same, as is the downward contour of the melodic dyad. The sketches also share a consistent (though unordered) pairing of specific chromatic dyads: for example pcs E\(=\) and E in mm. 2 and 4;\(^{226}\) pcs F and F\(</G=\) in mm. 2-3, 4, and twice in mm. 6-7 (once in an earlier layer);\(^{227}\) pcs G and G\(</A=\) in mm. 2-3, 5, and 6-7. The two sketches also share larger pc sets, such as the close proximity of pcs C, C\(<\), G,

\(^{226}\) It may be that the composer intended the sixteenth-note e\(^1\) in m. 2 (second note of the measure) to retain the accidental of the previous e\(^=1\). The immediate repetition of pitches is a characteristic of Webern’s early experiments with ordered and unordered tone rows, so this is a strong possibility. There are several instances of pitch repetition in the other settings of M. 211, sometimes involving E\(=\) (see the discussion of 103-0807), and Webern typically did not rewrite the accidental. Measure 8 of the nouveau sketch provides a similar example, this time with c\(<^1\) and, once again, e\(^=2\).

\(^{227}\) In m. 7 the f\(>^2\) and f\(<^1\) were circled and replaced by g\(^>^1\) and b\(^>^1\).
A=/>G<, and A at the cadences in mm. 2-3 and m. 5. The larger linear groups—such as \( \text{pcs G G}< (\text{or G< G}) \text{ B B= A C} \) in mm. 5-6 and 6-7 and the \( b^{=2} g^{=2} f^{=1} e^{=1} \) in m. 4 and the \( A<-G= \) (perhaps),\(^{228}\) as well as the f-e linear dyads in 6-7 (staves 4 and 5)—suggest that Webern was working with larger linear sets that he freely manipulated and rearranged. These characteristics are typical of Webern’s “proto-dodecaphonic” experimentation during the period in question, and similar compositional strategies can be seen in the fragmentary *Kinderstück*, M. 266, and the sketches of “Mein Weg,” op. 15 no. 4, as well as the subsequent sketches of “Mutig.” The most convincing argument for including the first nouveau sketch as the earliest of the M. 211 sketches rests on the comparison of this fragment with the two subsequent manuscripts, 103-0807 and 103-0808, both of which incorporate elements of both the earlier sketches. These comparisons will be made when the later manuscripts are described below.

**PSS 103-0807**

The second manuscript containing sketches of “Mutig,” 103-0807, is a 10½ stave, oblong format half-sheet, torn from its bifolio on the left edge and into a half-sheet along the bottom. There is no date, paper manufacturer’s stamp, or archival pagination on either side of the sheet. All writing in the sketch is in very light, sharp pencil. This fragment contains six measures of music for voice and piano, arranged in two staff systems. There are many circles, erasures, and revisions, and mm. 4 and 5 of the sketch spill over into revisions on staves 5 through 7. Like the nouveau sketch, 103-0807 provides a setting for only the first eleven words of the poem, or roughly half of the first couplet. The sketch starts off confidently and includes some dynamic indications, but m. 4 (the first full measure with text) gave Webern considerable difficulty, and the last two measures consist only of a vocal line without accompaniment.

---

\(^{228}\)There is a clef problem in mm. 6-7 staves 4 and 5. The fact that the two slurred dyads are “stemmed” together suggests that the upper linear dyad should be read as treble clef, even though there is a bass clef at the beginning of the staff. If so, then the reading providing above (\( A<-G= \)) is incorrect.
Comparison of the earliest nouveau sketch (the three-measure instrumental introduction shown in Example 4.39) with 103-0807 provides a strong argument in favor of including the earliest, textless sketch among those of M. 211. A comparison of the instrumental introductions of the two nouveau sketches and 103-0807 are provided as Example 4.41. Both the earliest nouveau sketch and 103-0807 begin with a melodic gesture comprised of the same four pcs, paired as two sets of unordered dyads: the unordered pitches e= and d and the pcs B and E. Whereas the initial pitches of the second nouveau sketch are completely different, the cadence in m. 2 of 103-0807 is rhythmically more similar to m. 5 of the second nouveau sketch than to m. 3 of the earliest sketch. The bass trichords in m. 5 of the nouveau sketch and m. 2 of 103-0807 also are formed very similarly, the outside (highest and lowest) pitches comprising a minor ninth, a very prominent interval in all four M. 211 sketches and in much of Webern’s music in general. Interestingly, the pc group C C< G A/=G< A, heard in close proximity near the cadences in mm. 2-3 and m. 5 of the nouveau sketch, does not appear in 103-0807 until m. 3, after the cadence with which it was first associated. The presence of this and other consistent pc groups suggests once again that some notion of pitch grouping lies behind Webern’s concept of this work.

Example 4.42 provides a transcription of 103-0807. This brief sketch of “Mutig” provides a clear example of aggregate phrasing, or what Donna Lynn has called composition with “abutting, unordered twelve-tone groups.” Interestingly, Lynn used this phrase to describe Webern’s “Armer Sünder, du”, op. 17 no. 1, one preliminary sketch of which appears on the verso of the earliest “Mutig” sketch (nouveau). Lynn’s further description of op. 17 no. 1 is enlightening with regard to the compositional

---

229 The minor ninth is the first interval in both the first of the nouveau sketches and 103-0807 and is the first interval in the voice of the second nouveau sketch. Also, the melodic dyads at this cadence in nouveau sketch m. 3 and 103-0807 m. 2 are both instances of ic 5, expressed as a descending perfect fourth in nouveau (c to g) and an ascending perfect fourth in 103-0807 (b to e).

230 Donna Levern Lynn, “Genesis, Process, and Reception of Anton Webern’s Twelve-Tone Music,” 73. The emphasis on unordered is Lynn’s.
Example 4.41: “Mutig,” M. 211, comparison of instrumental introductions
Op. 17/1 is not a strict twelve-tone composition, but presents nineteen, *unordered* twelve-tone groups across its sixteen measures (occasionally, some notes are missing or appear twice).\(^{231}\)

Although this description generally applies to “Mutig” sketch 103-0807, Lynn does not equate the completion of the nineteen aggregates in “Armer Sünder, du” with the structure of the poem or the delineation of musical phrases, traits which were obviously part of the composer’s plan when working on 103-0807. The brief musical conception in 103-0807 is divided into two clear aggregate phrases, the first of which comprises the piano introduction in mm. 1-3 and the second of which comprises the setting of the first vocal phrase, “Mutig trägst du die Last,” mostly contained in m. 4. It seems likely that

\(^{231}\) Lynn, 79-80.
In order to make this example as uncluttered as possible, the dynamics and vocal text have been removed. For clarity, missing accidentals have been inserted, as have missing clefs: for instance, the clefs at the beginning of staves 5, 6 and 7 and the return to bass clef between mm. 4 and 5 staff 7.
Example 4.43: “Mutig,” M. 211, PSS 103-0807, 5-7 and 6-7 sets

6-7 complements. The first five pitches of the vocal melody ($f^1$-$e^2$-$c^2$-$b$-$f^1$) are the same pcs that first appear on beats 1 and 2 of m. 2 and later in the piano pentachord on the downbeat of m. 5. The B$=$ at the end of m. 2 completes the first 6-7 set I, just as the b$=$ in the voice at the end of m. 4 completes the second. Likewise, the linear 6-7 set in the piano in m. 4 staves 3 and 4 forms the basis of the vocal melody beginning in m. 5—missing pc G from the 6-7 set I in both cases—but it is most likely that the vocal melody was composed first, and that the piano part of m. 4 was derived afterwards in reference to the vocal figure.

If Webern followed his usual working method, he first composed the instrumental introduction of 103-0807, fashioning it as an aggregate phrase. He then created a fourteen-note vocal melody to set poetic line 1. The composer used the pitch classes of the 6-7 set I, first appearing in m. 2, to create the first vocal phrase (m. 4), and he set the
The immediate repetition of a single pitch, as seen with e\textsuperscript{1} in m. 4 of 103-0807, is a device that appears in several of Webern’s early twelve-tone compositions and sketches. Both Moldenhauer (Chronicle, p. 313) and Shreffler (“Mein Weg geht jetzt vorüber,” 311) have commented on the “Morse-code effect” that this device produces in the Kinderstück, M. 267, a piece dating from August 1924, as well as other works composed near this time. Similar pitch repetition is also found in Schoenberg’s early twelve-tone works, such as the Präludium, op. 25 no. 1, a work that was completed in summer 1921 and that Shreffler has suggested may have influenced Webern’s earliest sketches of “Mein Weg geht jetzt vorüber” in the summer of 1922; see Shreffler, “Mein Weg geht...
piano figure, the composer took care to displace each note rhythmically, so that the entrance of each pitch in both the voice and piano is heard individually; i.e., no two pitches are attacked at the same time, so the unfolding of the aggregate phrase is clearly audible. The composer then circled everything in staff 6, again rejecting it (see Example 4.42). In the third and final version of the accompaniment in m. 4 (staff 7, labeled C) Webern made small adjustments to the rhythm and pitch order of the figure in the bass staff, although he apparently intended to keep the repeating e\(^1\) figure sketched in staff 5.

The decision to change the piano’s triplet figure at the end of m. 4 staff 6 to two eighth notes (staff 7) preserves the rhythmic identity of the vocal line. In the final version the triplet figures—used consistently in relation to the text “trägst du die” and “die andern nicht” in every setting of this poem—occur in the vocal line only.\(^{234}\) In both the second and third versions of the piano figure, the inversionally related trichords (pcs C\(<\ D\ E\) and G G\(<\ A\), a salient feature of the 6-7 set, are emphasized, much as they are in the voice in m. 5 (e\(^1\)-d-c\(^2\) and g-g\(^1\)-a\(^2\) in version 2, staves 5 and 6; e\(^1\)-c\(^1\)-d\(^2\) and g-a\(^2\)-a\(^1\) in version 3, staves 5 and 7). The final version of the accompaniment (staves 5 and 7) also contains a trichord in the left hand on the downbeat of m. 5. This trichord (F\(<\ B\ f\) joins with the c\(^1\) and e\(^1\) of the right hand to complete a 5-7 subset of 6-7 set I. Although the piano part of mm. 5-6 does not appear to be complete, the combination of pitches in the vocal and piano parts in these measures does present a complete aggregate that concludes on the last vocal pitch, b\(^1\). The rests that Webern wrote after the piano pentachord in m. 5 suggests that he was well aware of this arrangement, as of course we expect he would have been. Had the composer continued to compose other piano figures under the vocal line of mm. 5-6, the overlapping of aggregates may have made it more difficult to recognize subsequent aggregate formations. Once again, it is the fragmentary nature of this sketch that preserves the clear exemplar of the composer’s compositional

jetzt vorüber,” 294.

\(^{234}\)In 103-0807 the words “daß sie die” are also set as a triplet. In the nouveau sketch and 103-0808 these words are set as eighth notes. See the discussion of the vocal settings of all versions on pages 278-80.
process.

In summary, the arrangement of pitches in both the voice and accompaniment in “Mutig” sketch 103-0807, particularly in m. 4, suggests that Webern was purposefully experimenting with methods of internally organizing an aggregate phrase into complementary pitch class sets. In this case he refined the technique to include two sparsely articulated hexachords that are strongly combinatorial. It is interesting that the composer explored combinatorial hexachords in this sketch, falling as it does between his earliest experiments with and his final adoption of twelve-tone technique. There is also a suggestion of a very loose ordering of the pitches in 103-0807, although the brevity of the sketch does not allow us to be certain whether or not Webern conceived the vocal melody as a loosely ordered row or how such a strategy might have played out within the large-scale structure of the piece. There are of course no known row sketches for the “Mutig” sketch. However, when making sketches of “Armer Sünder, du,” op. 17 no. 1, a work that makes similar use of unordered twelve-tone groups, Webern did not derive a row from the vocal melody until the fifth page of preliminary sketches. Whether or not the setting of “Mutig” eventually might have evolved in a similar manner cannot be known.

PSS 103-0808

The third version of “Mutig trägst du die Last,” 103-0808, is a single-page fragmentary sketch containing ten measures of music for soprano voice, oboe, violin, cello, and harmonium. The music is written on two staff systems sketched on a loose-leaf whole sheet of 15-stave music paper torn from a bifolio along the left edge. The only writing medium is a very sharp, light pencil. As in the case of 103-0807, there is no date, paper manufacturer’s stamp, or archival pagination on either side of the sheet. The first four measures of the sketch are actually two different versions of the instrumental introduction, so the final layer of the sketch comprises only eight measures of music. In the revision of the introduction Webern replaced the initial oboe solo with a violin, and

---

the oboe does not appear again in this sketch. Unlike most of Webern’s pencil sketches, which are in condensed score, each of the three instruments called for in this sketch appears on its own staff or staves: the oboe/violin on the second staff, the harmonium on a grand staff formed by the third and fourth staves, and the cello on the fifth staff. This sketch is the most developed of the three M. 211 settings, comprising enough music to set the entire first couplet of the six-line poem. In addition to the ritardando in the violin in m. 3 and a pizzicato marking in the cello in m. 5, there are many subtle dynamic markings in the introductory measures, ranging between “ppp” and “p” with several crescendi and decrescendi. A fairly dense and largely chordal instrumental accompaniment appears beneath the setting of the poem’s first line in mm. 4-5, but mm. 6-7 are very messy with revisions, and the sketch was abandoned before the instrumental parts were filled in under the setting of the second poetic line.

Example 4.44 provides a transcription of “Mutig” sketch 103-0808. Like the 103-0807 version of “Mutig,” the instrumental introductions in 103-0808 are more or less clearly constructed as aggregate phrases. The first attempt at the introduction, in mm. 1-2 of Example 4.44, consists of only eleven pitches and is missing pc E. It is possible that a pc E is hidden beneath the scratchouts on the third beat of m. 1, or perhaps Webern originally intended the vocal entrance to supply the last note of the aggregate. In any case, the initial attempt was abandoned, and the composer began the introduction again in a very similar manner. The second version of the instrumental introduction, sketched in mm. 3-4, consists of 14 pitches, repeating pcs G and A=, and the aggregate phrase is complete when the cello (staff 5) plays F< at the end of m. 4, just before the vocal entrance. After this point later aggregate formations can be postulated only with difficulty, and it may be that the layering of various aggregates has obscured the compositional procedure. For instance, the vocal setting of the first poetic line in mm. 4-7, which begins and ends on pc D (d<sup>2</sup> in m. 4 and d<sup>1</sup> in m. 7), also repeats pc C< and the pitches b<sup>1</sup> and e<sup>2</sup>, resulting in a setting of the 14-syllable line that presents only 10 different pcs and does not include pcs G and G<. At the beginning of the second vocal phrase, however, the word “Liebend” in mm. 7-8 is set to g<sup>=2</sup> and g<sup>1</sup>. Given that the
Example 4.44: “Mutig,” M. 211, PSS 103-0808, diplomatic transcription

composer almost certainly sketched the entire vocal line before going back to sketch the instrumental parts of m. 5, as well as the abundance of evidence indicating that he was well aware of aggregate formations in his music, it is hard to imagine that he would not have been aware of such a circumstance, even if it was not his primary concern. A similar interpretation was offered previously in the discussion of 103-0807, in which the setting of the first poetic line alone presented an aggregate that was complete on the penultimate pitch of the phrase (m. 6 of Examples 4.42 and 4.43). Of course, the fact the these “vocal aggregates” in 103-0807 and 103-0808 do not coincide with the lineation of the poem weakens the hypothesis, and it is often impossible to positively verify that such arrangements are intentional, especially in sketches such as 103-0808, in which the pitch material is obscured by busy textures and copious revision.
The instrumental music of mm. 5-6 also presents an aggregate, though again in a rather convoluted manner. After the e that appears as the lowest pitch in the harmonium tetrachord in m. 4 staff 4, pc E does not appear again until the same pitch (e) is played by the harmonium as an element in the hexachord on the downbeat of m. 6. The harmonium’s e in m. 6 closes the aggregate formed primarily in m. 5, an aggregate that presents every other pc at least twice, with or without including the pitches of the vocal line, though it is worthy of note that the first vocal pitch on beat 2 of m. 6 is also pc E (e²). The rests that fall at some point on m. 6 beat 1 in every instrumental part support the reading of this instrumental music as an aggregate. After beat 1 of m. 6 the instrumental music becomes extremely difficult to interpret and features multiple layers of lightly drawn revisions, circles, scratch-outs, and overdrawn notes and accidentals that cannot be deciphered with confidence.

Unlike “Mutig” sketch 103-0807, there is no indication in 103-0808 that the composer attempted to segment the musical material into neatly arranged, complementary subsets. The overall appearance of this sketch is, in fact, quite chaotic, and it is difficult to find the kinds of musical interrelationships that are abundant in so much of Webern’s music. There are some general connections that may be made between various elements, such as the abundance of linear trichordal figures—the violin melodies in mm. 3 and 7, the cello melody in m. 4, the linear figures that comprise the harmonium tetrachords in m. 5, the descending violin figure in m. 5, and of course the triplet figures in the voice in mm. 5, 7, 8, and 10—but there are no outstanding rhythmic or intervallic relationships between these figures. The fragment does feature the grouping of chromatic dyads in the manner seen in the other “Mutig” sketches, yet the juxtaposition of pcs in an ic 1 relationship is a common feature in much of Webern’s music, as is the presence of numerous 3-3 pc sets, a feature also seen in 103-0808.  

236 The numerous appearances of the 3-3 pc set, a subset of the octatonic collection, serves to create a number of larger octatonic sonorities in 103-0808, including the 8-28 CI set that is formed by the vocal setting of “. . . nicht drücke. Liebend leihst du dein Licht . . .” in mm. 7-9. Like this complete CI set, however, which carries over a rest in the music and violates the lineation of the poem, nearly all of the larger octatonic sets that might be
Comparison of the “Mutig” Vocal lines

Example 4.45 compares the vocal lines from all three texted sketches of “Mutig.” Apparently, the poem’s meter suggested specific rhythmic figures to the composer from the outset, for some of these figures are common to all three sketches. For example, all three versions treat the poem’s first word, “Mutig,” in a manner that stresses the trochaic accentuation of the word, emphasizing the first syllable agogically and de-emphasizing the second. The vocal line of 103-0808 is slightly different, drawing out the first word over three entire beats, yet it is metrically similar. In all three versions the voice leaps to the second syllable, “-tig,” although in the earlier sketches the leap is a major seventh (downward in nouveau and upward in 103-0807), while in the later version the leap is only a minor third. All three sketches set “trägst du die Last” as a triplet figure resolving to a quarter or eighth note. The contours of the “trägst du die” triplets in the nouveau and 103-0807 sketches are very similar and obviously related, involving a major third between “-tig” and “trägst” (upward in nouveau and downward in 103-0807) followed by a minor ninth descent from “trägst” to “du.” The triplet is more strongly dactylic in 103-0808, since the vocal melody’s lowest note is the b= on “trägst,” emphasizing the first eighth note of the triplet. The lowest note of the vocal lines in the two earlier versions (b= in nouveau and b> in 0807, each approached by a leap and thereby emphasized) is on “du,” the second note of the triplet. The low “du” is an effective image of the “du” addressed in the poem, a saint who serves humbly and lays herself low before others, but Webern apparently decided that the emphasis on “trägst” was truer to the poem’s natural accentuation. The latest version also emphasizes “Last” more strongly, by placing it on the downbeat of a measure (m. 6) that was preceded by regular eighth and sixteenth notes in the instrumental ensemble. All versions observe the comma after “Last,” a

identified seem to be coincidental and not to represent any intentional and consistent compositional strategy.

237A non-pitched eighth note written above the vocal line on the downbeat of the first complete measure shows that Webern considered setting the text of 103-0808 just as in the two earlier sketches.
In Example 4.44 the bass line (presumably still played by cello), whose eighth-note rest occurs one eighth note sooner than the harmonium or violin lines, plays a d\(^1\) eighth note against the e\(^2\) of the voice, again creating the ubiquitous interval of a minor ninth during this still moment of the piece. This is the point where the instrumental parts of the two earlier sketches break down.

Example 4.45: “Mutig,” M. 211, comparison of vocal lines in all three versions

penthemimeral pause within the third metric foot, with a rest, and in 103-0808 this rest is a brief pause in nearly every voice. 238

The final version of the vocal line in 103-0808 seems to owe more to the nouveau sketch than to the one immediately previous. Nouveau and 103-0808 share two common pitches in the “trägst du die” triplets, b\(^=\) and a\(^1\) (the latter on “die” in both cases), and the two settings of “daß sie die” share both declamation and the repeat of a pitch on “daß sie” (c<\(^1\) in nouveau and e<\(^2\) in 103-0808). In these two sketches Webern also set the final word of the first line, “drücke,” as a descending major seventh (f<\(^<2\) to g\(^1\) in nouveau and c<\(^2\) to d\(^1\) in 103-0808), whereas in 103-0807 the final interval is a major third (g\(^1\) to b\(^1\)).

Finally, the text setting of 103-0808 demonstrates Webern’s appreciation of the subtle similarities and differences between the first and second lines of Kraus’s poem. The word “Liebend” is set very similarly to the earlier “Mutig,” and “liehst du dein Licht,” connected both metrically and through alliteration to the earlier “trägst du die Last,” is set to a figure that is not only similar rhythmically but whose pitches are the retrograde of the previous figure transposed up a minor second (b= d\(^1\) a\(^1\) e<\(^2\) in mm. 5-6 and e<\(^2\) b=\(^1\) d<\(^1\) b in mm. 8-9).

---

238 In Example 4.44 the bass line (presumably still played by cello), whose eighth-note rest occurs one eighth note sooner than the harmonium or violin lines, plays a d\(^1\) eighth note against the e<\(^2\) of the voice, again creating the ubiquitous interval of a minor ninth during this still moment of the piece. This is the point where the instrumental parts of the two earlier sketches break down.
CHAPTER 5
“WIESE IM PARK,” OP. 13 NO. 1

Manuscript Sources

The extant manuscripts containing Webern’s settings of Kraus’s poem “Wiese im Park” comprise a complete series of compositional materials representing each stage of the composer’s creative process from preliminary pencil sketches and continuity draft to revision draft and printer’s copy, as well as both sketches and a fair copy of the piano-voice reduction. As the only published Kraus setting, “Wiese im Park” is the only one of Webern’s Kraus songs to present such a complete record. As we have seen, only two of Webern’s other Kraus settings reached the continuity draft stage—“Vallorbe,” M. 232, and “Vision des Erblindeten,” M. 236—and three survive only in fragmentary settings—“In tiefster Schuld,” M. 210, “Flieder,” M. 246, and “Mutig trägst du die Last,” M. 211. The extant manuscripts of “Wiese im Park” are listed in Table 5.1.

Two Early Sketches

The earliest of Webern’s sketches on a poem by Kraus are found in a series of five manuscript pages (101-0502 through 0506) that contain two distinct attempts to set “Wiese im Park,” a poem that first appeared in Die Fackel in December 1915. Both of these fragmentary settings, one for voice and small instrumental ensemble (101-0502) and another for voice and piano (101-0503 through 0506), are dated “Leoben 1916” in the

1The catalog number for the manuscript materials of “Wiese im Park” is M. 221.

2Die Fackel 413-17 (10 December 1915): 128.
Table 5.1.: Manuscript Sources of Webern’s Settings of “Wiese im Park”


2. Sketch fragment, four pages, 33 measures (eight of twelve lines set), voice & piano, “Leoben 1916,” PSS film 101-0503 through 0506 (Folder 40).

3. Continuity draft, six pages, 22 instruments, “Sommer 1917” on page 1 and “16.VI.17” at end, PSS 101-0474 through 0479 (Folder 39).

4. Revision draft (intended as fair copy of 1917 version), twelve pages, 15 instruments, “1917” and “1917 Klagenfurt,” PSS 101-0407 through 0410 (three autograph title pages and one instrumentation list, respectively) and PSS 101-0411 through 0422 (Folder 36).

5. Continuity draft of voice-piano reduction, four pages, “Februar 1924,” PSS film 101-0462 (autograph title page) and 101-0467 through 0469 (Folder 38). This version of the work contains ideas that are found in the 1917 revision draft and the erased and revised layers of the printer’s copy.

6. Printer’s copy, twelve pages, the many revisions include reduction of instruments (may have been nearly identical to revision draft before revision), archived with several title pages and instrumentation lists, Pierpont Morgan Library.

7. Fair copy of voice-piano reduction, five pages, PSS 101-0444 through 0448 (Folder 37).

composer’s hand. Together they provide the only extant evidence of Webern’s creative activity during the 22 months between February 1915 and December 1916 that he spent in military service.3 After a series of military assignments in Klagenfurt, Görz, Windisch Feistritz, Frohnleiten, and Niklasdorf, Webern was finally assigned to a reserve battalion in Leoben from late August through mid-December 1915. At Webern’s request Zemlinsky had petitioned the military to grant Webern a leave of absence, and he was given a furlough to work in Prague’s Deutsches Landestheater until 5 April 1916.4 At his

---

3Moldenhauer, Chronicle, 265.

own request, however, Webern’s leave was canceled in late January, and he returned to his post in Leoben, where he remained until 23 December 1916, when he received a permanent discharge from military service due to extreme near-sightedness. The composer noted the date of his release as the first entry in a small, ornate notebook that served as a diary until 1939. According to Moldenhauer, Webern’s military duties throughout his assignment in Leoben were light and occupied him only in the mornings, with the exception of the summer months. Webern’s letters from July 1916 describe strenuous military duties, such as extended maneuvers in mountainous terrain. Otherwise, Webern was very musically active during both of his Leoben assignments, playing the cello several times a week in a chamber music ensemble organized by the battalion’s adjutant. He also had access to a rented piano, which he placed in the private home at Krottendorfergasse 11, where he lived with his family. Thus, the final months of Webern’s military service provided him with the privacy, the free time, and the piano necessary to take up composition once again. Although we cannot determine the precise dates when the composer worked on the two early sketches of “Wiese im Park,” they most likely were created during the fall of 1916.

“Wiese im Park” Sketch Fragment No. 1: PSS 101-0502

The earlier of the two Leoben settings of “Wiese im Park” is a single-page, fragmentary sketch (101-0502) containing approximately five measures of music for

---

5Moldenhauer, Chronicle, 212-15.

6This diary is generally referred to as Notebook 6 and is reproduced on PSS microfilm 111.1-0317 through 111.1-0385.

7Chronicle, 215.

8Ibid., 217.

9Moldenhauer writes that Webern first began setting “Wiese im Park” “at Leoben during autumn of 1916”; see Chronicle, 266. Rode also suggests that these sketches of “Wiese im Park” date from late autumn of 1916; see “Anton Webern und Karl Kraus: Aspekte einer ungewöhnlichen Kraus-Rezeption,” 324 n. 10.
soprano voice and an ensemble of the following eleven instruments: flute, clarinet, bass clarinet, trumpet, trombone, violin, viola, cello, double bass, harp, and celesta. The sketch was written on a looseleaf half-sheet, containing 12 staves. The music on the page is divided into two systems of four (staves 1-4) and three (staves 6-8) staves, respectively, although the second system contains only a single measure of very lightly notated and unorchestrated music, which is actually a sketch for m. 1. The only writing medium used in these manuscripts was a sharp and very light lead pencil. The composer dated the sketch page “Leoben 1916” in the upper right corner, probably several years after the sketch was created. This early version of the orchestral song sets only the first four words of the poem, “Wie wird mir zeitlos,” a complete sentence (followed in the poem by a period) that constitutes roughly half of the first line of the twelve-line poem. The sketch is in condensed score format and includes abbreviated instrumental indications and a few articulation markings, mostly slurs and the flutter-tongue marking on the trumpet part of m. 2 staff 2. The first three measures of the sketch were produced with the self-assured compositional fluency and immediacy that mark the early measures of many such sketches, although what follows in the final measures is more tentatively notated. Like many of Webern’s abandoned song sketches, this one begins with a well-developed instrumental introduction, darkly written in a firm hand, and then quickly wanes shortly after the initial gesture of the vocal line. Webern’s abandoned sketch fragments often break down at sectional divisions within the poem, such as the end of a line or stanza, and in this case the sketch never recovered from the silence with which Webern recognized the period after “zeitlos.”

As in the published version, Webern’s earliest concept of “Wiese im Park” was as an orchestral song, but otherwise the music of the earliest sketch is completely dissimilar to the published version. A transcription of sketch fragment 101-0502 is provided as Example 5.1.\textsuperscript{10} The impulsive character of the manuscript—the immediacy of the first

\textsuperscript{10}To facilitate clear discussion, the measures in Example 5.1 have been numbered according to the barlines in the manuscript, ignoring both that the barline between mm. 4 and 5 has been scratched out and that m. 6 is a preliminary version of m. 1.
Example 5.1: “Wiese im Park,” PSS 101-0502, sketch fragment no. 1, transcription

measures, followed by an abrupt dissipation of momentum—cannot be captured in a transcription, which inevitably and misleadingly endows the later notes the same visual weight as those found in the first two measures, although in this case much of the instrumental music in m. 3 and everything thereafter is very tentatively sketched. As in many of Webern’s sketches, the music of this sketch fragment was orchestrated from its inception, and many of the scratch-outs and corrections are instrument changes, as can be seen beneath the bass line of m. 3. Although the barlines in the manuscript separate the music into six measures, the sketch actually contains only five measures of music (if we ignore that Webern scribbled over the barline between mm. 4 and 5, changing the five measures into four and probably indicating a change in meter), for the apparent sixth measure is actually a sketch for m. 1. All six pitches that were written into m. 6 appear
on the downbeat of m. 1 (shown in Example 5.2 by the rectangular boxes labeled 6-Z12), although the rhythmic configuration is different and pcs B= and F are displaced by an octave. Had the sketch proceeded beyond the first system, the composer probably would have erased these preliminary jottings before continuing. The handwriting in m. 6 is so light and small that such erasures could have been made easily and completely. In mm. 4 and 5 Webern did not sketch beneath the working measures but lightly sketched ideas within the measures themselves, a trait found in all of the other unfinished sketches.

The first sketch fragment for “Wiese im Park” provides yet another clear example of aggregate phrasing. The first aggregate of the piece is complete on the downbeat of m. 2, when the opening violin solo resolves to d\textsuperscript{1}. As the most rhythmically active of the polyphonic lines in the introduction, the violin melody is more likely to be heard as a foreground element, and therefore the resolution of the aggregate in that voice strengthens the cadence. The c\textsuperscript{1} and e\textsuperscript{=} that form the upper two pitches of the trichord in staff 4 also represent the first appearances of their respective pitch classes, so these two figures also participate in the closure of the first aggregate. The instrumental parts of mm. 1-2 are then followed by eighth rests on the second half of beat 1, further confirming the end of the first subsection, and the vocal entrance of the downbeat of m. 2 elides with this first instrumental phrase. The second musical phrase of the sketch, mm. 2-3, also presents an aggregate. The d in the bass clarinet at the end of m. 3 staff 4 is the first representative of that pitch class in this subsection, and once again the phrase is clearly delineated by the rests that fall in every part on the downbeat of m. 4.

An octatonic analysis of sketch page 101-0502 is provided as Example 5.2.\textsuperscript{11} As the example demonstrates, one reasonable parsing of the various figures in the first two measures reveals the instrumental introduction to be strongly octatonic. The five-pitch violin figure in staff 2 provides a 5-10 CI set, while the accompanying figures in the third and fourth staves of mm. 1-2 are drawn from the other two octatonic collections. The

\textsuperscript{11}As in all of the analytical examples in this dissertation, the octatonic sets in Example 5.2 are beamed together, regardless of actual rhythm. Other, non-octatonic, pc sets are identified by a bracket, as in m. 3 staff 2, or by a box, as in m. 6 staves 2-4.
The scoring of the instrumental figures in mm. 1 staves 3 and 4 supports the octatonic analysis of these figures; the clarinet and viola play the CII set, and the bass clarinet and cello play the CIII set. As mentioned above, of course, the e and c on the downbeat of mm. 2 belong to both octatonic sets.

Example 5.2: “Wiese im Park,” PSS 101-0502, sketch fragment no. 1, octatonic sets

two-pitch clarinet figure in mm. 1-2 staff 3 (g-a) combined with the four pitches that have upward stems in staff 4 (b-d-c-e) together create a 6-Z49 CII set, whereas the four pitches in staff 4 that have downward stems (f-B-g-E) are all drawn from octatonic collection III. The stems in Example 5.2 show that the CIII set of the two lowest lines can be expanded to include the e and c on the downbeat of mm. 2 staff to create yet another transposition of the 6-Z49 pc set. The slanted line that the composer

12 The scoring of the instrumental figures in mm. 1 staves 3 and 4 supports the octatonic analysis of these figures; the clarinet and viola play the CII set, and the bass clarinet and cello play the CIII set. As mentioned above, of course, the e and c on the downbeat of mm. 2 belong to both octatonic sets.
drew in staff 4 between the d\textsuperscript{1} at the end of m. 1 and the e= on the downbeat of m. 2 (reproduced in Example 5.1) might be simply an indication of voice-leading, but it could in some manner be a sign of the composer’s recognition that the e= and c\textsuperscript{1} belong to both collections.

After the instrumental introduction the CIII sonority presented by the introduction’s lowest instruments emerges as the harmonic basis of the vocal line in mm. 2-3, which presents a 5-16 CIII set that shares three pcs (pcs F< G B=) with the previous 6-Z49 CIII set. The irregularly shaped box superimposed on parts of mm. 2-3 staves 1-3 shows that a complete octatonic set (always an 8-28 pc set) is presented at the beginning of the second phrase, until this sonority is undercut by the repeated a= in the bass. This repeated a= is the first pitch in the CII collection that comprises the bass line for the rest of the fragment. Example 5.2 shows the two CII sets that are divided by the quarter rest on m. 4 beat 1; the combination of these two sets creates a 6-30 CII set (not shown). This CII set includes the low A\textsubscript{1} that was scratched out and is presented in Example 5.2 in alternate notation. In staff 3 another deleted note, the e=\textsuperscript{2} on the downbeat of m. 3 (circled in the manuscript and also shown in the analysis in alternate notation), may have originally been part of the figure that is beamed together in Example 5.2 as a 4-17 CIII set, although it is uncertain whether or not all four notes were ever “active” in the same layer of sketching.

In contrast to the linear figures, nearly all of which are octatonic, no vertical figures are drawn from octatonic sets. The first pentachord of the piece (m. 1 beat 2) is a 5-Z12 (labeled as 6-Z12 in Example 5.2 because the box includes the e\textsuperscript{1} in staff 2), and the instrumental pentachord that concludes the introduction on the downbeat of m. 2 forms a non-octatonic 5-Z36 set (a 6-Z47 pc set if the vocal line’s g\textsuperscript{1} is included). Likewise, neither the instrumental tetrachord on beat 3 of m. 3 (a 4-16 pc set) nor the tentatively notated tetrachord on beat 2 of m. 4 (a 3-4 pc set) is octatonic. In this earliest of the “Wiese im Park” fragments Webern may have used the octatonic collections to create a contrapuntal texture of octatonic lines, but the vertical dimension of the piece is not so organized.
“Wiese im Park” Sketch Fragment No. 2: PSS 101-0503 through 0506

The second Leoben sketch of “Wiese im Park” (101-0503 through 0506), a setting for voice and piano, is a four-page, fragmentary sketch containing approximately 33 measures of music. The four pages are half sheets torn from bifolios, and they represent two different paper types, neither of which matches the paper used for the earliest “Wiese im Park” sketch, 101-0502. Sketch pages 101-0503 and 101-0504 are two halves of the same page, and the verso of 101-0503 has a paper manufacturer’s stamp: J. E. & Co., No. 2, 12-staff. Likewise, sketch pages 101-0505 and 101-0506 are two halves of another single sheet, and the verso of 101-0506 has a manufacturer’s stamp: J. E. & Co., No. 28, 28-staff. The final page of the draft, 101-0505, was dated by the composer “Leoben 1916” in the upper right corner. This four-page fragmentary sketch of “Wiese im Park” is much more extensive than the earliest sketch and provides music setting two of the poem’s three four-line stanzas. It is possible that not all compositional materials for “Wiese im Park” are extant, but the spatial arrangement on the final page of this sketch series suggests that Webern did not proceed any further with this particular version. As is often the case at the end of an abandoned Webern sketch, the final page of this version (101-0505) degenerates to only a lightly sketched vocal line for several measures before the music ends altogether. The final notes of the vocal line are at the left edge of a new system, indicating that Webern abandoned the sketch at this point.

One notable feature of the piano/voice version of “Wiese im Park” is its length. Although the sketch is fragmentary, setting only two-thirds of the poem, it is as long as the published version, which is itself one of the composer’s longer works. In order to compare the lengths of Webern’s middle period songs and fragments, Shreffler has counted the number of the beats within each piece. For incomplete settings she

13The order of these manuscript pages in the PSS microfilm is not the musical order. The musical order is 101-0503, 0504, 0506, and 0505. The verso sides of each folio are blank and are not included in the microfilm.

14Shreffler provides tables containing her findings in “Webern’s Trakl Settings,” 65 and Lyric Impulse, 89.
extrapolated how long a complete setting of the poem might have been, according to the amount of time taken by the existing music and the amount of remaining text. The fragmentary piano/voice version of “Wiese im Park” encompasses 99 beats, and, assuming that Webern continued in a similar manner, a complete setting of the text would be approximately 149 beats, compared to only 102 beats in the published version. Shreffler’s description of another Webern fragment from January 1915, “In der Heimat” (Trakl), as “self-consciously long” would seem to apply to this second of Webern’s “Wiese im Park” sketches as well.\textsuperscript{15} Indeed, the sketch fragment for “In der Heimat,” a 59-beat setting of half the fourteen-line poem (therefore, approximately 118 beats if finished), would be considerably shorter than the piano/voice version of “Wiese im Park,” which had the potential to be one of the longest works of this period.

Various evidence suggests that after 1914 Webern was “self-consciously” attempting to break away from the aphoristic style that had marked his creations between 1911 and 1914, epitomized by works such as the \textit{Six Bagatelles for String Quartet}, op. 9 (1911-13), the \textit{Five Pieces for Orchestra}, op. 10 (1911-13), or the posthumously published \textit{Three Pieces for String Quartet} (1913), the latter of which contains a setting of the minute (13 words) original poem “Schmerz, immer blick nach oben” as its second movement.\textsuperscript{16} In a letter to Schoenberg from May 1914 Webern relayed his intention to write an extended work for cello and piano, apparently in a response to Schoenberg’s suggestion that Webern once again try to write more extended movements.\textsuperscript{17} When the work was laid aside in favor of the succinct \textit{Three Little Pieces for Cello and Piano}, op. 11, Webern dreaded Schoenberg’s reaction: “I beg you not to be angry that it has again become something so short.”\textsuperscript{18} The \textit{Three Little Pieces} was the last purely instrumental

\textsuperscript{15}\textit{Lyric Impulse}, 87.

\textsuperscript{16}Movements 1 and 3 of the \textit{Three Pieces for String Quartet} later became movements 1 and 6 of the \textit{Six Bagatelles}, op. 9.

\textsuperscript{17}Moldenhauer, \textit{Chronicle}, 205.

\textsuperscript{18}Letter to Schoenberg, 16 July 1914, cited in Moldenhauer, \textit{Chronicle}, 205; \textit{Chronik},
work that Webern would complete before he embarked on a decade-long preoccupation with vocal music.

**Sketch Page 1, PSS 101-0503**

A transcription of the first page of the 1916 piano/voice version of “Wiese im Park” is provided as Example 5.3. This page comprises the first nine measures of the piece, although mm. 8-9, which are very messy with revisions, were recomposed on sketch page 3 (101-0506). The slashed-circle symbol above the left barline of m. 8 indicates where the revised version of the passage was to be inserted. Once again, the sketch begins with a confident and detailed conception; the first two measures of the sketch contain several articulation markings (tenuto marks under the first two notes of staff 2 and several later slurs), a very soft dynamic (ppp), and the evocative performance direction “wie ein Hauch” (like a breath). In many ways the 1916 piano/voice version of “Wiese im Park” is musically quite different from the earliest orchestral song sketch, even though the two were almost certainly created during a rather short period of time. For example, the piano/voice version of “Wiese im Park” is completely devoid of triplets or any of the complicated cross-rhythms and displaced attacks that obscure the basic pulse in the earlier orchestral song sketch. The earlier sketch fragment is also far more contrapuntal. With the exception of the first two measures and brief piano interludes, the basic texture throughout the piano/voice version is that of a fairly chromatic vocal line above trichords or dyads in each of the piano’s staves, along with an occasional linear bass figure. Manuscript 101-0503 also contains the only setting of “Wiese im Park” in which the word “zeitlos” is not followed by at least a brief period of silence, although there are rests in the vocal line. Perhaps Webern intended the pedal tone G, in m. 4 to convey a sense of timelessness, although the descending trichords in the piano’s treble

185. “Ich bitte Dich, nicht unwillig zu sein darüber, daß es wieder etwas so Kurzes geworden ist.”

19 This transcription does not maintain the relative spatial positioning between the two systems.
Example 5.3: “Wiese im Park,” PSS 101-0503, sketch fragment no. 2, page 1, transcription

clef continue in a fairly active rhythm.

Despite the differing musical surfaces of the two early “Wiese im Park” sketches, the two fragments do have a few common characteristics. Moldenhauer made this observation in his description of these manuscripts, when he wrote that “the settings show some similarities of approach,” although he did not elaborate. In addition to the initial 3/4 meter that is shared by all versions of the work, both the fragment in 101-0502 and the piano/voice version begin with instrumental introductions that outline an aggregate, although the two treatments of the aggregate demonstrate subtle differences. In sketch fragment 101-0502 the aggregate was completed by the instruments at the moment of the

20Moldenhauer, Chronicle, 265.
vocal entrance, but in 101-0503 the aggregate is completed by the first pitch of the vocal line, b1. The vocal lines of the two Leoben versions are also somewhat similar, especially with regard to general contour and the placement of certain pitches, although their respective rhythms differ. Both early versions of the vocal line set the second and third words, “wird mir,” to the pitches b1 and a1,21 both vocal lines then move to the extreme high or low point of the phrase on the first syllable of “zeitlos” (highest point, f<2, in 101-0502 and lowest point, b=, in 101-0503); and this extreme point is ic 1 below the initial vocal pitch. Finally, in both sketches the vocal lines move away from this registral extreme, leaping either a diminished or perfect fourth back towards the mid-range of the vocal phrase.

The piano/voice version of “Wiese im Park” also exhibits the use of the octatonic collections in a manner that clearly seems intentional, at least in the first few measures. An octatonic analysis of the first page of the piano/voice version (101-0503) is provided as Example 5.4. As in the earlier sketch fragment, the CIII octatonic collection dominates the earliest measures. As the example demonstrates, the first four pitches in the second staff of the piano introduction (mm. 1-2) form one 4-3 CIII set,22 and four of the pitches in the piano’s left hand (staff 3) form another, although the G< that appears twice as the bass of a G< - c< dyad (m. 1 beat 3 and m. 2 beat 2) is not a member of that collection. The combination of the two 4-3 CIII sets in the piano introduction results in a complete manifestation of CIII (an 8-28 CIII set, not marked in Example 5.4), in which each of the

21 On sketch page 101-0502 the word “mir” was first set to the pitch b=1, but was then revised to a1, as it appears on page 101-0503 of the piano/voice version. This order of revision provides some evidence that the 1916 orchestral song fragment is the earlier of the two Leoben sketches.

22 If the 4-3 set in mm. 1-2 staff 2 is expanded to include the b=1 at the end of m. 2 staff 2, then the set formed is a 5-16 CIII, the same pc set that was outlined by the brief vocal line of the 101-0502 version (Example 5.2 mm. 2-3). These two 5-16 CIII sets share the pitches g1 - b=1 and the pc F<. In 101-0503, however, the b=1 in question is a pick-up to the following trichordal figures, so to analyze it as part of the earlier figure—from which it is separated by rests—is not musically satisfying. The relationship with the 5-16 CIII figure in the earlier manuscript is probably coincidental.
The complement to CIII is comprised of pcs D F A = B. As the complement of CIII, all four of these pitches are members of both CI and CII.

Example 5.4: “Wiese im Park,” PSS 101-0503, sketch fragment no. 2, page 1, selected octatonic and non-octatonic sets

eight pitches is heard only once. This CIII collection is completed by the e^1 on the second half of beat 2 in m. 2 staff 2, and the complete CIII collection is thus separated from the music that follows by rests in both the treble and bass clefs of the piano part, in much the same manner that Webern often used rests to delineate complete aggregates. The G< that emerges as a dissonance in the prevailing CIII sonority of mm. 1-2 can be included in the 4-18 CI collection in staff 3 at the end of m. 2; this set includes three of the four pitches in the complement of the CIII collection, therefore it appears to be an intentionally “anti-CIII” set.\(^{23}\) The b=^1 at the end of m. 2 staff 2 can be included in the CI set below (creating a 5-32 CI set), as is illustrated by the vertical dotted line, but this pitch is also a

\(^{23}\) The complement to CIII is comprised of pcs D F A= B. As the complement of CIII, all four of these pitches are members of both CI and CII.
member of the CIII sonority, which returns on the downbeat of m. 3. In turn, the “anti-CIII” set in the bass at the end of m. 2 is followed by a four-note bass melody (m. 3 beats 1 and 2) comprised of three pitches (F<-A-A-E=) from the complement of CI.

Although the CIII sonority is fairly strong on the first two beats of m. 3, as is demonstrated in Example 5.4 by the 6-27 CIII set, two of the pitches on these beats (the f° half-note in the upper voice of staff 2 and the first vocal pitch, b') are not drawn from that collection. Three of the pitches in the tetrachord on the downbeat of m. 3 are part of CIII, yet the tetrachord as a whole is not octatonic (boxed in and labeled as a 4-6 set), containing the chromatic series pcs F-F<->G (spelled as f°-F<-g). On the next beat of that measure the three-pitch chromatic series is transferred to the vocal line, which enters with b'-b=a and is therefore also not octatonic as a whole and forms part of another 4-6 set. On beat 3 of m. 3 both of the non-CIII dissonances, pcs f° and b', resolve by half-step into the 5-32 CIII sonority that encompasses the trichord in staff 2 and the last four pitches of the vocal phrase. In the bass the CI set at the end of m. 2, which was interrupted by the F<-A-A-E= bass figure of m. 3 beats 1 and 2, is resumed when the bass line D plunges downward to G, on the downbeat of m. 4 and then back up to B= in m. 5. These pitches are shown in Example 5.4 as part of a larger 6-Z50, but the sustained bass notes, G,B=, are also part of the CIII collection.

In a manner similar to the beginning of the first vocal phrase in mm. 3-4, the second vocal phrase, “Ruckwärts hingebannt” (the second half of the first poetic line), is

24At the end of m. 4 staff 2 the eighth-note f° moves up a tritone to the b' in the upper voice of the trichord on the downbeat of m. 5 staff 2. This motive was perhaps first modeled by the juxtaposition of f° and b' that occurs in m. 3 beat 1 and 2 between the upper voice of the trichord in staff 2 (f°) and the first note of the voice (b').

25It is possible that Webern was dispersing the CI collection throughout the texture in the following manner: the 4-18 CI in the bass of mm. 1-2 provides the first four pitches of that collection, pcs C<D F G<. Pitch class B is the first note of the vocal line, and then the missing pcs G and B= are supplied by the sustained bass notes in mm. 4 and 5. The remaining pc E is represented in other voices of the texture—for instance, the upper voice of the trichord tied over from m. 3 to m. 4 and the middle note of the trichord in m. 5 staff 2—but this analytical approach seems strained.
set above a strong CIII harmony, labeled 5-16 CIII in Example 5.4. The only exceptions to the CIII collection in m. 5 are the tetrachord on the downbeat, which forms a 4-5 pc set, and the d\textsuperscript{2} that appears twice in the vocal line. The non-octatonic 4-5 set on the downbeat is related to the first vocal phrase, with which it shares two pitches, b\textsuperscript{1} and e\textsuperscript{1}, and the pc B=\textsuperscript{1}. Once again the note setting the first word of this phrase (d\textsuperscript{2} on “Rück[wä]rts”) emerges as a dissonance in the predominant octatonic sonority. Pitch classes B and D occur again in the next measure, for the phrase “Rückwärts hingebannt” (Returning transfixed) is set above a repetitive harmonic pattern. The trichords c\textsuperscript{1}-e\textsuperscript{1}-b\textsuperscript{1} and a-c<1-f<1 underlay the phrase twice, perhaps to illustrate the lack of forward motion to which the text alludes. At the end of this phrase the bass figure in mm. 6-7, G-B-B-C, is similar in contour to the F<1-A-A-E= bass line of m. 3, although the intervals and rhythm are different. In both instances the bass figure repeats the middle note and is followed by an eighth rest and then by an eighth note that initiates a perfect-fourth descent (D-G\textsubscript{1} in mm. 3-4 and B-E in mm. 7-8).

Although the multiple and messy revisions in m. 8 make the motives difficult to interpret, it appears that a strong CII sonority emerges in mm. 7-8 for the first time in the piece. A complete 8-28 CII octatonic set is shown in Example 5.4, but once again the octatonic analysis cannot account for every pitch in the measures. The only earlier CII set in the piece is the 3-3 CII trichord on beat 2 of m. 4. The vocal line of m. 8 was extensively revised, but it appears that the final layer is closely related to the vocal phase immediately previous. In mm. 5-6 “[Rück]wärts hingebannt” was set to c\textsuperscript{2}-d\textsuperscript{2}-e\textsuperscript{1}-e=\textsuperscript{1}, and in m. 8 the words “ich und stehe” was set to c\textsuperscript{2}-d\textsuperscript{1}-e=\textsuperscript{2}-e\textsuperscript{2}.

**Sketch Page 2, PSS 101-0504**

A transcription of sketch page 2, 101-0504, is provided as Example 5.5.\textsuperscript{26} This

\textsuperscript{26}The measure numbers in each of these examples have been assigned without regard for the actual musical order within the overall work; i.e., in the examples the first measure of each sketch page is numbered as m. 1, regardless of whether the measures were deleted from the final layer or whether they actually comprise revisions of earlier measures.
Example 5.5: “Wiese im Park,” PSS 101-0504, sketch fragment no. 2, page 2, transcription

small sheet contains only four measures of music, the first two of which are variant settings of the word “Wiesenplan,” the last word of the poem’s second line. The music of mm. 3-4 sets all of the poem’s third line, except for the final word “Schwan.” Along with the setting of the words “und stehe fest im,” first sketched in the last two measures of sketch page 1 (101-0503), the entire passage on page 2 was recomposed in the second system of sketch page 3 (101-0506) with minor changes, as will be discussed below.

Sketch Page 3, PSS 101-0506

The third page of the fragmentary piano/voice version of “Wiese im Park” contains sixteen measures of music arranged in three systems; as mentioned previously, however, many of these measures actually comprise either a revision or clean recopying of music that was first sketched on the first two pages of the sketch series. The first system on page 3 contains four measures of music setting the last word of poetic line 3, “Schwan,” and all of line 4, “Und dieses war mein Land.” The music of this system is quite messy with revisions, especially in the last measures, and was rewritten in the second and third systems with no substantial change. Furthermore, the last four measures of the third system were scratched-out by a large wavy line (not included in Example 5.6) so sketch page 3 contains only eight measures of music in the final layer. The scratched-
out measures in the third system might be abandoned sketches for a piano interlude initially planned between the settings of the poem’s first and second stanzas, although the figures appear to be loosely related motivically to the instrumental parts of sketch page 4 and might therefore be preliminary sketches for later measures.

A transcription of the second and third systems of sketch page 3 is provided as Example 5.6. A comparison of m. 5 of 101-0506 with m. 8 of 101-0503 (Example 5.3), both settings of “und stehe fest im,” reveals that the two versions are very similar in most respects, although the piano part of the latter version appears to have been more completely fleshed out. The primary differences between the instrumental parts of the two versions are the last trichord on beat 3 (c<1-f<1-c<2 in Example 5.3 m. 8 and g<1-c<2-f<2 in Example 5.6 m. 5) and the moving bass line added to the latter version. The difference in the vocal parts is largely a matter of octave equivalence. In m. 5 of 101-0506 the composer lowered the octave of pc E= on the first syllable of “stehe,” creating a much more conjunct vocal line. In m. 6 he first made a similar change, lowering the repeated f<2 that set the last two syllables of “Wiesenplan” in 101-0504, but then he resketched the three vocal pitches of m. 6 above the staff (staff 1 of Example 5.6), replacing the first f<2 with a<1. The composer also worked in the staff below the three-staff system to revise the bass line of m. 6; he circled the earliest legible bass figure in staff 4 of that measure and rewrote the figure in staff 5.

Some of the pitch changes that occurred during the revisions of mm. 8-14 in 101-0506 weakened an already dubious octatonic construction of this passage. In the earlier version preserved in 101-0504 there were a few notable octatonic sets, most of them drawn from the CI collection, although they were frequently interrupted in mid-phrase...

27 The measure numbers in this example were assigned starting at the beginning of the sketch page. Since Example 5.6 does not include the first four-measure system of page 3, the first measure of the example is m. 5. If the revised passage in Example 5.6 were inserted according to the symbol on page 1 of the sketch series, the excerpt would comprise mm. 8-16 of the sketch’s final version, excluding the final four scratched-out measures on page 3. There is only one word of text in the second and third systems of this page, the word “Land” in m. 12, but all of the text has been inserted in the example to ease discussion.
Example 5.6: “Wiese im Park,” PSS 101-0506, sketch fragment no. 2, page 3, systems 2 and 3, transcription

and rarely formed complete chords, so that an octatonic analysis of the passage lacks musical sense. For example, the vocal line in mm. 2-4 of 101-0504 (Example 5.5) from the $b^1$ on the first syllable of “Wiesenplan” to the $b^1$ on the first syllable of “Spiegel” forms a 6-Z13 CI set, but the octatonic collection is then interrupted by the $f<^1$ on the second syllable of “Spiegel” and once again by the following $a^1$ on “der.” In the 101-0506 revision of m. 8 (Example 5.6 m. 6) the insertion of $a^1$ into the vocal line interrupts the CI octatonic set even earlier. If an octatonic compositional method originally underlay this passage, the revisions have obscured that foundation. Certainly, none of the revisions were intended to enhance the octatonic sonority. Two of the only “intact” CI chords in the 101-0506 version are the pentachord on the downbeat of m. 8, a 5-19 CI set, and the pentachord that concludes the phrase on beat 2 of m. 9, a 5-25 CI set. Despite the
change of vocal pitch in m. 9 from f\textsuperscript{1} to g\textsuperscript{1}, both of these verticalities are octatonic in both versions of this passage.\footnotemark

Indeed, most of the pitches in mm. 8-9 are drawn from CI, but there are several pcs F< and A in both measures, including those that set the second syllable of “Spiegel” and the word “der” in m. 8. It is possible that Webern intended these non-CI pitches as passing dissonances that are resolved by the return of the CI sonority at the end of the phrase on m. 9 beat 2, particularly the f< in the upper voice of staff 4 which resolves chromatically to f.

Characteristic of the passage between mm. 7 and 9 is the illustrative setting of the idea of “Spiegel” (mirror), sung by the soprano in m. 8. In both versions of the passage sketched on 101-0506, the word “Spiegel” was set to a descending perfect fourth, b\textsuperscript{1}-f<\textsuperscript{1}, while the upper voice of the piano’s treble clef mirrors this interval with an ascending perfect fourth, e'-a\textsuperscript{1}. Webern also used linear palindromes to depict the mirror image.

The portion of the vocal line that sets “dem grünen Spiegel hier der Schwan” in mm. 7-9, not including the g\textsuperscript{1} on beat 2 of m. 9 (i.e., the pitches e\textsuperscript{1} through c<\textsuperscript{2}), forms the palindromic interval class pattern 4-1-4-5-4-1-4. Two of the other linear motives in this passage also take part in painting the mirror image with palindromes of their own.

Between the downbeat of m. 7 and beat 2 of m. 9 the slow-moving lower voice of the piano’s treble clef moves b= - b - b = , and between the same starting point and the downbeat of m. 10 the upper voice of the piano’s bass staff moves f< - e - f - f< - f - e = - f< . The figure in the upper voice of the piano only approximates a palindrome, since the penultimate pitch is a semitone lower than the second (e and e=). The accidental on this e[=] is not at all clear and may very well be a natural. The final pitch of this pattern is the f< half-note in staff 3 (piano treble staff). In the earlier version of this passage (system 1 of 101-0506) the pitch was written in the piano’s bass staff.

\footnotetext{The first setting of “Schwan” in the first system of 101-0506 placed a f\textsuperscript{i} at the end of the two-pitch slur. The change from f\textsuperscript{i} to g\textsuperscript{1} changed the pc set class of the chord (4-27 CI set in the original version) but not the octatonic collection to which it belonged.}
Sketch Page 4, PSS 101-0505

A transcription of the last page of sketches for the fragmentary piano/voice version of “Wiese im Park” is provided as Example 5.7. The composer dated the manuscript “Leoben 1916” in the upper right corner. The sketch contains approximately fourteen measures of music, consisting mostly of a well-developed vocal line over an incompletely conceived piano part. The vocal line on this page comprises enough music to set all of the poem’s second stanza. In mm. 3, 7-9, and 12-14 the oddly declamatory vocal line appears above nearly empty staves in the piano. The sporadic absence of the piano part gives this manuscript an appearance that is quite unlike any other among Webern’s Kraus sketches. It is not at all unusual for the vocal line of a sketch to be more extensive than the instrumental accompaniment; Webern always composed the vocal line first, often proceeding to a sectional division within the poem—the end of a line or stanza—before returning to the beginning of the unit and composing the instrumental accompaniment. In this sketch, however, it appears that Webern wrote large sections of the vocal line—perhaps first setting the entire stanza—and then he went back and composed the piano part only at certain cadences and for the brief piano interludes between poetic lines. This pattern continues to the end of the sketch; under the last vocal pitch, after two measures without piano accompaniment, Webern wrote a single note B♭ under the b♭=1 on “blau.”

Given the tentative nature of the music on this final sketch page, one might expect that any fundamental pattern or compositional technique, either aggregate-oriented or octatonic, might clearly emerge, having not yet been obscured through layers of revision. No such pattern or technique is discernible, however. Whether the vocal and piano parts are considered separately or in combination, the phrases and interludes either present only a partial aggregate, as in mm. 2-3, which are missing pcs C, E, and F, or the aggregate is completed before the musical unit ends, as in mm. 10-14. Likewise, very few octatonic sets of more than three adjacent pitches can be reasonably parsed from the texture, one exception being the 4-12 CI set in the piano in m. 2. This octatonic tetrachord underlays a particularly chromatic vocal line, comprised of a 7-7 pc set (pcs A A= G F< E= D C<
Example 5.7: “Wiese im Park,” PSS 101-0505, sketch fragment no. 2, page 4, transcription
Earlier linear trichords in the vocal line appear in 101-0503 (Example 5.3) m. 3 (b₁-a=₁-g₁) and in m. 6 (d₂-e₁-e=₁) and, even more obvious, a¹-a=₁-g₁). Such linear chromatic trichords have been a fundamental characteristic of the vocal line throughout this piece. On the last sketch page pairs of chromatic trichords appear again in the vocal phrases of mm. 7-9 (a¹-b=₁-a=₁ and a¹-b=-a¹-g<₁) and mm. 11-12 (d=₂-c²-d¹ and e¹-d¹-e=₁). In the latter instance the very chromatic vocal line (pcs B= B C C< D E= E F G in normal order) introduces the only other audible octatonic sonority, the 5-28 CI set that is formed by all of the pitches in mm. 13-14. In this predominantly chromatic context, the 5-28 CI set also seems coincidental.

The primary concern in the setting on this last and only partially conceived sketch page seems to have been the interpretation of the poetic images, and in some measures it appears that Webern was not yet certain how he would proceed. For instance, it is possible that the composer intended to set the phrase “Die vielen Glockenblumen” in a recitative-like fashion over a sustained chord, as it appears in m. 3 of the manuscript, but it is more likely that he was not yet certain how he would accompany that image. The moving piano part at the end of m. 3 through m. 4 is loosely derived from the figures that he first sketched and then scratched out in the last system of the previous sketch page, 101-0506, and appears to represent the sound to which the voice harkens late in m. 4 (“Horch”). On the word “schau” another sustained chord (d-f<₁-c<₁) is heard in the bass, this one identical to the first three pcs of the vocal line in m. 3 (f<₂-d²-c<₂). This sustained chord was probably intended to paint the words “wie lange” at the beginning of m. 7. Under the image of the admiral butterfly in m. 9 it appears that the composer was

---

29 Earlier linear trichords in the vocal line appear in 101-0503 (Example 5.3) m. 3 (b¹-b=₁-a¹), m. 6 (d²-e¹-e=₁) and m. 8 (d¹-e=₂-e¹), the subsequent revisions of which only changed the octave of the pcs and in 101-0506 mm. 1-2 in the earliest legible setting of “und dieses” (f<₁-a=₁-g₁, not shown in any example) and in m. 5 (d¹-d<₁-e¹, Example 5.6).
Continuity Draft  

For his third attempt at setting “Wiese im Park” Webern returned to the orchestral song genre with a relatively large ensemble of at least 22 instruments. The result was a hastily sketched continuity draft that presents the opus 13 version of “Wiese im Park” in nearly complete form. This continuity draft comprises six pages of music in condensed score, written as a vocal staff above three instrumental staves. The six pages of music are written on four recto and two verso sides of four loose half-sheets (101-0474 through 0479). All writing in the manuscript is in lead pencil, except for the red pencil that the composer used to write the title of the poem on the first page and to number the six successive pages of the draft. In accord with his usual practice, Webern dated the continuity draft after the last measure, “6.VI.17” (6 June 1917), signifying that the piece had achieved a definitive stage. The first page of the draft also is dated “Sommer 1917” in the composer’s hand. As mentioned in Chapter 1, the approximate date (season and year, as opposed to specific date), as well as the page enumeration, were probably added long after composition, when Webern gathered and organized his earlier sketches.  

The continuity draft of “Wiese im Park” was composed during Webern’s stay at his father’s home in Klagenfurt from late May through July. On 24 May 1917 the composer’s family had given up their residence in Vienna, where they had been living since Webern’s release from military service in December 1916, in preparation for their move to Prague, where Webern was to begin his position at the Deutsches Landtheater in
August. The seven-month interim between military service and the move to Prague proved to be the composer’s first truly productive period in nearly two years. In January he began working on a string quartet—inspired by his participation in the string quartet at his post in Leoben—but his most successful efforts were again focused on vocal compositions. The poets that drew his attention were the same as those he had set in 1915, before his military service: Goethe, Kraus, Rosegger, Trakl, and Bethge’s translations of Chinese poets. In addition to numerous fragmentary sketches, Webern managed to complete six songs that were eventually published as parts of four different opus-numbered groups: “Die geheimnisvolle Flöte,” op. 12 no. 2; “Gleich und Gleich,” op. 12 no. 4; “Wiese im Park,” op. 13 no. 1; “In der Fremde,” op. 13 no. 3; “Abendland III,” op. 14 no. 4; and “Fahr hin, o Seel,” op. 15 no. 5.

Webern’s first success of 1917 had occurred in late March with a continuity draft of “Gleich und Gleich” (no. 4 of Four Songs, op. 12) for voice and piano, based on a poem by Goethe. Another fragmentary piano-voice setting on the Goethe poem “Gegenwart,” M. 220, was also created in March, but there is no evidence that Webern ever revisited this poem. A few days later, on 10 April, Webern had sketched out his setting of “Die geheimnisvolle Flöte,” op. 12 no. 2, another of Li-Tai-Po’s poems from Die chinesische Flöte, also for voice and piano. The drafts of “Gleich und Gleich” and “Die geheimnisvolle Flöte” were apparently written fairly quickly; both appear in full continuity drafts without any previous sketches. The continuity draft of “Wiese im Park” suddenly materialized during June in much the same manner. Although there had been two previous fragmentary sketches on the poem, the continuity draft bears no obvious musical relationship to either.

---


32 Shreffler’s dissertation lists 26 separate song manuscripts in 1917, in addition to three string quartet fragments; see “Webern’s Trakl Settings,” 331-33.

33 Chronicle, 265. Although the four songs of op. 14 were then completed, the collection would not be published until 1925.
Webern, always inspired during his summers in Carinthia, composed at an increased pace while in Klagenfurt, and by the time he had to leave for Prague four orchestral songs had been completed. A series of enthusiastic letters to both Schoenberg and Berg during June and July kept Webern’s associates apprized of his creative progress. The following excerpt from a letter to Berg written on 1 July is typical of Webern’s Klagenfurt correspondence: “I am again deep in composition. At first I experimented a lot. Now I believe I have succeeded with two orchestra songs. . . .” The “experimentation” Webern referred to is undoubtedly reflected in the many fragmentary settings and alternate readings, such as the first two fragmentary settings of “Wiese im Park,” that preceded the compositional fluency of the summer months.

While in Klagenfurt, Webern dedicated himself to two tasks—song composition and the study of Schoenberg’s published songs. In a letter to Schoenberg on 13 June Webern mentioned that he had brought along the scores of Pierrot lunaire, op. 12, Erwartung, op. 17, and Das Buch der hängenden Gärten, op. 15. “I am occupying myself almost exclusively with your music,” he wrote. “Every day I play these works.” Later that month, after creating the continuity drafts of both “Wiese im Park” and a setting of Trakl’s “Abendland III” (op. 14 no. 4), Webern wrote to Schoenberg and again mentioned the influence of Pierrot lunaire:

I am now hard at work. I think it is going well again. And I hope that it will last. I have composed 2 orchestral songs. One on the poem “Wiese im Park” by Karl Kraus, one on a poem by Trakl. I am gradually gaining clarity again. For that I thank your “Pierrot”!

---


35Moldenhauer, Chronicle, 266; Chronik, 240. “. . . bin fast ausnahmslos mit Deiner Musik beschäftigt. Jeden Tag spiele ich in diesen Werken.”

Unless we dismiss Webern’s remarks as mere flattery for his master, Webern was using Schoenberg’s songs, particularly *Pierrot lunaire*, as guides in the creation of his own works. To Webern, Schoenberg’s songs demonstrated the “clarity” toward which he strove, a clarity that he had possessed in the past and that he was now “gradually gaining again.” After a long period of very little compositional activity, Webern’s resumption of composition is marked by abandoned sketches that explore seemingly disparate musical interpretations and ensemble combinations. This experimentation is evidenced by the many fragments that Webern produced, beginning with the first two sketches of “Wiese im Park.” Webern required several months to refocus his activities as a composer, and the study of *Pierrot lunaire* helped him to regain a state of mind conducive to composition. Paradoxically, the beacon of *Pierrot lunaire* led Webern not to imitation of his master but to works that both composers regarded as individually expressive. After his move to Prague, Webern’s comments in a letter to Schoenberg again pay homage to Schoenberg’s op. 21, while also proclaiming the individuality of his own accomplishments. “This year I have in truth tried to copy your Pierrot directly. . . . Your judgement of my compositions tells me that I am achieving something really of my own.”

Webern boasts of positive remarks from Schoenberg regarding these orchestral songs, and he obviously was pleased with his compositional progress when he again wrote of these settings in a letter to Berg later that summer:

> Now I am mourning the end of summer, i.e., the time when I could work. I have gone along the right paths. Schoenberg has confirmed this. Now I am writing quite differently. I have composed four orchestral songs. Homogeneous sounds, in part long themes, altogether something entirely different from before the war. I have felt this for some time. Now when I could have proceeded so well with my

---

37 Letter to Schoenberg, 12 September 1917, quoted in Moldenhauer, *Chronik*, 241; “Erst heuer wieder habe ich doch eigentlich versucht direkt Deinen *Pierrot* zu copieren. . . . Daß ich gerade so was Eigenes leiste, sagt mir Dein Urteil über meine Kompositionen.” Moldenhauer translated “zu copieren” as “to follow,” minimizing the strength of Webern’s statement; see *Chronicle*, 267.
work, I must be in the theater. . . . My conscience bothers me. It is our duty to compose.\textsuperscript{38}

The positive comments received from Schoenberg must have been in response to the more complete versions of the orchestral songs represented in the fair and revision copies that Webern also created that summer. Example 5.8 provides a transcription of the first four measures of “Wiese im Park” as they appear in the continuity draft.\textsuperscript{39} Like others of Webern’s end-dated continuity drafts, that of “Wiese im Park” does not present a complete representation of the work. The scoring and interpretive markings are incomplete, a few heavily revised measures remain ambiguous, and there are significant musical differences between this version and the subsequent revision score. A fairly detailed outline of the work was achieved, however, and with a few noteworthy exceptions the uppermost layers of revision establish the pitches and rhythms of the published version. For instance, in m. 1 the tetrachord on beat 2, played by the woodwinds, includes \(d^2\) as its lowest pitch. To the left of this chord Webern inserted a small letter “c” in the second space, indicating that the lowest pitch should be \(c^2\), as appears in subsequent versions. A similar revision is found in the second tetrachord of m.1, this time played by the brass, which includes a \(b^\#\) played by the horn. This pitch does not appear in later versions but is superseded by the \(c<^2\) indicated by “cis” in the fourth space, as Example 5.8 shows.

The vocal line that emerged in the continuity draft bears a strong resemblance to that found in the revision draft. As opposed to the instrumental parts, which exhibit a


\textsuperscript{39}This transcription closely recreates the original spacing and placement of expressive markings, stem directions, and other features.
variety of detailed performance directions, there are very few articulation, dynamic, or other expressive markings in the vocal line, although the revision score, prepared soon afterwards, abounds with many specific instructions. Most of Kraus’s poem is not written in the manuscript, although the strictly syllabic setting makes it a simple matter to determine where each syllable should be set. The first, fifth, and last pages (101-0474, 0478 and 0479, respectively) contain non-pitched rhythmic notation above the vocal staff in some measures, indicating the rhythm of the vocal declamation. There are no extant preliminary sketches of this version of the work (indeed, there may never have been any), and Webern seems to have set most of Kraus’s poem with relative ease from beginning to end. A notable exception occurs at the first line of the second stanza, “Die vielen Glockenblumen! Horch und schau!” (The many bluebells! Listen and look!), which obviously gave the composer particular difficulty. In this section of the manuscript (page 2, 101-0475, and page 3, 101-0476) the corrections and revisions, on, beneath, and above the staves, become so dense that Webern was forced to rewrite several measures in their entirety three times. Amid the resulting multiple layers, at least four variants of the vocal line can be reconstructed, although much has been scratched out and erased. Example 5.9
provides both complete and partial alternate settings of poetic line 5, equivalent to mm. 14-19 of the published version.\textsuperscript{40}

Perhaps the most interesting feature of the continuity draft is the scoring, which calls for at least 22 instrumentalists, an ensemble significantly larger than that of the published version.\textsuperscript{41} Many of the scratchouts and revisions within the continuity draft itself, and the most substantial differences between it and the subsequent revision score, pertain to scoring. Although most of the draft’s instrumental music is painstakingly scored, the instrumentation of some notes and chords remains inconclusive. As we shall see, many final details were worked out in the revision score. The chamber orchestra of the continuity draft is one of the largest of Webern’s ensembles since the \textit{Six Pieces for Large Orchestra}, op. 6 (original version composed in 1909), and the \textit{Five Pieces for Orchestra}, op. 10 (composed in 1911 and 1913). The large ensemble of the continuity draft, however, would not survive subsequent revisions; the chamber orchestra of “Wiese im Park” was pared down to 15 instruments in the revision draft and then to 13 in the published version.

The continuity drafts of “Die Einsame,” “Im der Fremde,” and “Ein Winterabend,” op. 13 nos. 2-4, respectively, were also scored for larger instrumental

\textsuperscript{40}This example does not include the various time signatures written in the manuscript and does not attempt to make metric sense of every measure.

\textsuperscript{41}According to my reading, the 22 instruments called for are: 2 flutes, E♭= clarinet, B♭= clarinet, bass clarinet, 2 trumpets, trombone, 2 horns, doubled strings, celesta, glockenspiel, harp, and tamtam.

Shreffler (“Webern’s Trakl Settings,” 92) counts the instrumental designations as 23, including a bass drum, but the inclusion of the bass drum is dubious. Webern usually indicates bass drum with “gr. Tr.” (grosse Trommel), as he did in the continuity draft of “Vision des Erblindeten” (103-0785, m. 3). “Tr” appears many times in the continuity draft of “Wiese im Park,” but Webern used this abbreviation for trumpet, sometimes clearly attaching it to a pitch, which, of course, would not be the case if it was a bass drum indication. Webern was inconsistent in the manuscript, however, also using the abbreviation “Tromp” and once spelling it out as “Trompete m[it] D[ämpfer]” (trumpet with mute). In Example 5.8 the four-note chord at the end of m. 1 provides an example of Webern using both “Tr” and “Tromp” to indicate double trumpets; clearly he intended the $f<^2$ to be played by a trumpet.
The larger, 16-member ensemble is the ensemble described in the instrumentation list that accompanies the revision score of “Die Einsame” in PSS folder 36 (101-0424). This list is the second side of a bifolio that includes the last (fifth) page of “Die Einsame” on side 3. This list does not include the glockenspiel, which plays two notes in mm. 24-25 and 28 of the published version.

Likewise, the chamber orchestra of “In der Fremde” was reduced from 16 in the continuity draft to nine instruments in the revision score, and “Ein Winterabend” was reduced from 17 instruments in the continuity draft, to 13 in the revision score, and to 10 in the printer’s copy. There are, in fact, no orchestral songs in

Example 5.9: “Wiese im Park,” continuity draft, various settings of line 5

The larger, 16-member ensemble is the ensemble described in the instrumentation list that accompanies the revision score of “Die Einsame” in PSS folder 36 (101-0424). This list is the second side of a bifolio that includes the last (fifth) page of “Die Einsame” on side 3. This list does not include the glockenspiel, which plays two notes in mm. 24-25 and 28 of the published version.

Shreffler, Lyric Impulse, 56. Shreffler wrote that the revision score of “Wiese im Park” is written for 15 instruments including solo strings, perhaps creating the impression that there are only four string parts. In addition to one violin and one viola, the revision score also calls for two cellos and two double basses, for a total of six strings. The paired cellos and double basses each have a separate part, however, and are labeled as soloists in the revision score. As the discussion of the printer’s score will reveal, revisions in that version reduced the ensemble to include a single part for each member of the string family.

Webern’s published oeuvre that require an ensemble as large as that scored in the “Wiese im Park” continuity draft, yet between 1917 and 1919 Webern generated several song sketches and continuity drafts that call for comparably large ensembles, often requiring doubled or tripled instruments. For example, one fragmentary sketch on Trakl’s “Gesang einer gefangenen Amsel” from 1917 (later revised and published as op. 14 no. 6) is scored for a 17-member chamber orchestra, including two trumpets, three trombones, and three double basses. Likewise, the continuity draft of “Ein Winterabend” includes two flutes in its 17-member ensemble. Pairs of like instruments in the “Wiese im Park” continuity draft appear in Example 5.8 in the three four-note chords of mm. 1 and 2, which call for two flutes, two trumpets, and two double basses. On page 2 of the draft (equivalent to m. 14 of the published version) Webern called for “2 Hörner” in m. 8 of the second system (see Example 5.10). In the revision draft of “Wiese im Park,” a transcription of which is provided as Example 5.11, Webern lightened the scoring in m. 1, giving the first tetrachord to the celesta and the second to the strings. In the continuity draft Webern wrote “Streicher” to the right of this second chord (see Example 5.8), anticipating the revised orchestration.

At the sketching and continuity draft stages Webern apparently wrote for the instruments that he “heard” as he composed, making frequent changes and using any instruments he wished, without concern for practical considerations. Webern apparently tried to visualize the entire instrumental complement for the first time only when creating revision scores, and these scores (many of them, like that of “Wiese im Park,” intended as fair or printer’s copies) are often accompanied by multiple, revised lists of required instruments. Several such lists are archived along with the revision and printer’s scores of “Wiese im Park.” In the revision scores Webern generally reduced the size of the orchestra, removing most doubled instruments and eliminating those that were used too

---

45Shreffler, Lyric Impulse, 198.

46This draft is dated 10 July 1918. See Shreffler, “Webern’s Trakl Settings,” 92 and 333. Shreffler’s list (p. 332) also includes one sketch on Trakl’s “Siebengesang des Todes,” M.227, dated “1917 Klagenfurt,” that requires 20 instrumentalists.
Example 5.10: “Wiese im Park,” PSS 101-0475, continuity draft, page 2, system 2, transcription

infrequently to be practical. For example, the bass clarinet in A, called for in the continuity draft of “Wiese im Park” (as well as other manuscripts), was changed to the more common bass clarinet in B=.

Likewise, the English horn used in the revision score of “Ein Winterabend,” op. 13 no. 4, was eliminated and the lines reorchestrated, probably because the instrument did not appear in the first three songs of op. 13.

At the revision and printer’s copy stages Webern was also influenced by the practical consideration of grouping songs with compatible scoring. After completing revision drafts of “Wiese im Park,” “Die Einsame,” and “In der Fremde” (the latter two on texts by Bethge) for similar ensembles, his desire to create mates for these songs may have influenced his selection of instruments in subsequent sketches. Shreffler has observed that the revision drafts of the op. 13 songs and the longest unpublished

---

Example 5.11: “Wiese im Park,” PSS 101-0411, revision score, page 1, transcription
continuity drafts—”Vallorbe,” M. 232, “Vision des Erblindeten,” M. 236, and
“Nächtliches Bild,” M. 233 (text by Bethge)—employ a core ensemble approximately as
follows:

| Winds: | flute (picc), clarinet, bass clarinet |
| Brass: | horn, trumpet, trombone |
| Plucked and Keyboard: | harp, celesta |
| Percussion: | glockenspiel, (bass drum, triangle, timpani, bells) |
| Strings: | violin, viola, cello, bass |

Not all drafts use all of the instruments listed here; “Vallorbe,” for example, does not use
flute or bass drum, and the glockenspiel does not appear in “Vision es Erblindeten.”
None of the scores or drafts uses all of the percussion instruments.49

Revision Score

The revision score of “Wiese im Park” is a twelve-page full score (PSS 101-0411 through 0422)50 partitioned into three bifolios of the same paper type: J. E. & Co., No. 7, 22-staff.51 The small orchestra listed in the revision score is the same as that called for in the published version of the piece, with the exception that the revision score uses two solo cello parts and two solo double basses. The vocal line was written on the staff

48 Shreffler, “Webern’s Trakl Settings,” 92. I have added the triangle to Shreffler’s list.

49 Interestingly, no double reed instruments are scored in Webern’s published orchestral songs, even though they frequently appear in sketches, continuity drafts, and revision scores. “Die Einsame,” for instance, calls for a bassoon in the revision score but not in the printer’s copy. See the op. 13 revision score instrumentation list on page 40.

50 The same PSS folder that contains the “Wiese im Park” revision score (Folder 36) also contains five pages of revision score for each of the other three songs of op. 13.

51 All five pages (a bifolio and a loose leaf) of the revision score for op. 13 no. 3 are also written on this paper type. The last (fifth) page of op. 13 no. 4 uses the same paper, although the first four (in one bifolio) have 20 staves. Op. 13 no. 2—the earliest of the revision scores for op. 13—is written on 32-staff paper. The revision score for op. 13 no. 2 is also the only one of these four that has the vocal line written on the top staff of the score. In the other three the vocal staff is above the strings, as in the published version.
between the glockenspiel and strings, and the instrumental parts appear in the appropriate transpositions. Like others of Webern’s fair and printer’s copies, the primary writing medium is dark ink, although the barlines are in lead pencil, and colored pencils were used to bracket together the various instrumental groups (blue for woodwinds, orange for brass, and green for strings). There are many erasures, some deep enough to make holes in the paper, as well as scratchouts and other revisions in the same dark ink used to create the manuscript’s primary layer. Webern obviously continued to compose anew and revise even as he created this full score—not surprising, considering the incomplete state of the continuity draft. Some of the copious revision cluttering the manuscript—mostly but not exclusively dynamic and tempo changes—is in lighter ink and in lead and red pencils (the latter only for tempo changes), suggesting that Webern made revisions on more than one occasion.

### Title Pages and Instrumentation Lists

Webern produced the revision score in the summer of 1917, soon after “Wiese im Park” had reached the more or less definitive stage achieved in the continuity draft. As mentioned in Chapter III, throughout his creative career Webern typically generated an ink full score immediately after completing the continuity draft of a new work. While the “Wiese im Park” revision score itself is not dated, all three autograph title pages archived in the PSS along with the score date “Wiese im Park” as “1917” (101-0407 and 0409) or “1917 Klagenfurt” (101-0408). We know, however, that Webern typically regarded the date of the continuity draft as the date of composition, even if the work was

---


53The title pages are written on vertical format staff paper of three different paper types: 101-0407, 40-staff; 101-0408, 22-staff; 101-0409, 18-staff.
substantially revised later, as is the case with “Wiese im Park” and the other songs of op. 13.

Title page 101-0407 was created sometime between 1921 and 1925. This page, written entirely in blue pencil, lists the published title and opus number of the work, “4 Lieder mit Orchester, op. 13,” as well as the titles and composition dates of the four songs in the collection. The appearance of the correct opus number and, more importantly, the inclusion of “Ein Winterabend” as the fourth of the Four Songs, indicate that Webern did not create this title page until sometime after 1921. Universal Edition first began publishing his works in 1920, so Webern could not have known the opus number of Four Songs before that time. The sequence of opus-numbered works apparently had been established by 1921, when Egon Wellesz wrote an article on the composer’s song collections opp. 12, 13 and 14. In this article Wellesz listed the four songs of op. 13 as follows:

1. Wiese im Park
2. Der Einsame [sic]
3. In der Fremde
4. Fahr’ hin, o Seel’

As of 1921, therefore, “Ein Winterabend” was not yet the fourth of the op. 13 songs. Scored for only five instrumentalists, “Fahr’ hin, o Seel,” a 1917 setting of Rosegger’s poem (later published as op. 15 no. 5), seems an odd match for the other three songs of op. 13, especially considering that in 1921 the first three songs of op. 13 had not been through their final revisions, revisions that would reduce the instrumental forces to the

54“1) Wiese im Park (1917) / 2) Die Einsame (1914) / 3) In der Fremde (1917) / 4) Ein Winterabend (1918).”


57Shreffler suggested that Webern had not included “Ein Winterabend” in the opus 13 songs, despite its suitability with regard to scoring, because he was withholding it for inclusion in an anticipated song cycle on texts by Trakl; see Lyric Impulse, 74-75.
still much more substantial numbers known today. After these final revisions the composer created still more title pages; these pages currently are archived along with the printer’s copy in the Pierpont Morgan Library. Therefore, manuscript 101-0407 was probably intended as the title page of op. 13 when the revision score of “Wiese im Park” was the most recent version: i.e., before final revisions and the creation of the printer’s copy.

Likewise, this explanation could apply to 101-0409, a title page that also presents the correct opus number, along with a list of the individual songs and their composition dates. This manuscript is written in two mediums. Webern first used red pencil to write his name and the title of the work in the upper right corner of the page. He then used a lead pencil to write the opus number, a list of songs and dates, and a note concerning publication: “Febr. 1925 U. E. übergeben” [submitted to Universal Edition February 1925]. The earliest writing on this page—the red pencil title—might date from before the final revisions took place and even from before Webern knew the opus number of the work, although neither hypothesis can be verified.

Title page 101-0408 is more complicated and raises interesting possibilities. On this page the composer first wrote “op. 5 (1-4)” in red pencil in the upper right corner. This inscription was then scratched out with a lead pencil, and all other writing on the page is in that medium. Without any indication of genre, the red pencil inscription tells us very little. Webern might have envisioned any of his compositions after 1913 as his op. 5, since the original version of his Six Pieces for Orchestra was published at his own expense in that year and designated as op. 4. Webern’s eventual op. 5, the aphoristic Five Pieces for String Quartet (composed in 1909), was not published by Universal Edition until 1922. I suspect that the “op. 5 (1-4)” inscription may not be related to the op. 13 songs at all, and that Webern simply reused an old title page, possibly marking out

---

58 Moldenhauer, Chronicle, 128. The 200 copies printed in 1913 were published by the Straube printing house under the imprint “Im Selbstverlag des Komponisten” [self-published by the composer]. Webern revised the work, reducing the instrumental ensemble, and Universal Edition published it as his opus 6 in 1956. The original large orchestral version was published in pocket score by Universal Edition in 1961.
the red pencil inscription some time after 1921. Also on title page 101-0408 is “op. 13
drei Lieder mit orch,” yet the “3” of “13” appears to be written over a “4,” and the word
“drei” is written over the word “drei.” Slightly further down the page, roughly beneath
“drei Lieder,” Webern wrote the dates “1914 u[nd] 1917,” not including the 1918 date of
“Ein Winterabend.” Then, yet further down the page, Webern ultimately designated the
work as “Vier Orchesterlieder, op. 13” and listed the respective dates of all four songs,
including that of “Ein Winterabend” [“1918 Mödling”]. Although everything except “op.
5 (1-4)” is written in pencil, the overwrites and the repetition of the work’s title suggest
that Webern wrote on this title page at various times. At some point he may have
considered publishing the first three songs of op. 13 as “Drei Lieder mit Orchester,”
perhaps as op. 14, without either “Fahr’ hin, o Seel” or “Ein Winterabend.” The most
compelling evidence of this is the overwritten title “drei Lieder mit Orch,” followed by
the dates 1914 and 1917. The first three orchestral songs of op. 13 are the only
compositions that both fit the genre description and were composed in those years. Of
course, Webern is known to have used the term “Orchesterlieder” rather loosely in
references to his compositions of this period.  

In addition to several title pages, Webern also produced an instrumentation list to
accompany the revision scores of *Four Songs*, op. 13. This list is one of many such lists
that Webern often included with his full scores, and one of two that are cataloged along
with the revision scores in the PSS. The list is written in black ink on a small piece of
unlined paper glued to the upper left corner of an otherwise blank sheet of 18-staff music
paper (PSS 101-0410). This instrumentation list groups the instruments into families of

---

59 In letters to Schoenberg and Berg from the summer of 1917 Webern refers to both
“Wiese im Park” and “Abendland III” (Trakl) as “Orchesterlieder,” although the
continuity draft of “Abendland III” is scored only for voice and three instruments. See
266.

60 Another instrumentation list is written on side 2 (verso of side 1) of the same bifolio
that contains the last page of the five-page revision score for “Die Einsame” (on side 3 of
the bifolio).
woodwinds (Holzbläser), brass (Blechbläser), strings (Streicher), and finally harp and percussion:

Holzbläser: 1 Flöte (abweise[n]d? mit Picc.)
1 E=Klar, auch B-Klar
1 Bass-Klarinette
1 Fagott

Blechbläser:
1 Horn
1 Tromp.
1 Posaune

Streicher:
1 Geige
1 Viola
2 Violoncelli
2 Contra-Basse

Harfe, Celesta, gr Trommel

On the back of this scrap of paper Webern rewrote the last line to include the glockenspiel, which is used in op. 13 nos. 1 and 2, followed by the total number of required musicians:

Harfe, Celesta, Glockenspiel, grosse Trommel
17 Musiker

The 17 instruments on this list correspond with most of the instruments called for in the revision scores of op. 13, but again it seems that Webern had not yet included “Ein Winterabend” in the group. The 1918 revision score of that work calls for English horn. Flute is used in “Wiese im Park” only, and piccolo is called for in “Die Einsame” and “Der Fremde.” The bass drum and bassoon are used in “Die Einsame,” as is the triangle, although the latter is not included in the instrumentation list and none of the three appears in the published version.

The creation of title pages and instrumentation lists for the revision score version of “Wiese im Park” suggests that Webern considered publishing the song as it appears in that manuscript. Webern must have considered the 1917 revision score to represent the definitive version at the time of its creation and for several years thereafter. Had the work been published earlier, the manuscript might have served as the printer’s copy. Certainly, the printer’s copies that Webern did submit to Universal Edition—for instance, the 1925
printer’s copy of “Wiese im Park” (discussed below)—were often no cleaner than the
1917 revision copy. With regard to the general appearance of the manuscript, some of the
messiest revisions cluttering the revision score may have been added after Webern had
decided to revise the op. 13 songs further. For instance, the fourth page of the “Die
Einsame” revision draft (101-0428) contains substantial re-composition, appearing as
sketches in condensed score format on the page’s extra staves. The resulting “messiness”
that resulted on this page suggests that Webern had given up on using this manuscript as a
printer’s copy.

Another interesting feature of the revision score of “Wiese im Park” is the
widespread use of the indications *Hauptstimme* (principal voice) and *Nebenstimme*
(secondary voice) above the instrumental lines throughout the score. These symbols have
been reproduced in Example 5.11 in m. 3 (*Hauptstimme* in the clarinet and *Nebenstimme*
in the celesta) and 4 (*Hauptstimme* in the trumpet). Although these markings are a
common feature of Webern’s revision scores, Universal Edition never included them in
the published editions.

**Printer’s Copy**

The printer’s copy of the *Four Songs*, op. 13, is located in the Robert Owen
Lehman Collection of the Pierpont Morgan Library, New York, as are most of the
printer’s copies that Webern prepared for Universal Edition. The folder, labeled “Lieder,
full score, op. 13,” contains 25 pages of autograph manuscript, constituting the printer’s
copies of all four op. 13 songs. The folder also contains several title pages and
instrumentation lists that accompany each of the four songs. The “Wiese im Park”

---

61 The bifolios and loose leaves of the printer’s copies represent a variety of paper
types. All of these manuscripts are gathered together in a single bifolio of 12-staff music
paper (No. 2, 12-staff) that serves as a folder. The first side of this cover bifolio is an ink
title page: “Vier Lieder / für / Gesang und Orchester / von / Anton Webern / op. 13 / -
Partitur -”. The verso of the title page contains an instrument list for each song. The
instruments listed are identical to the published version, and the few revisions in lead and
purple pencils deal primarily with the wording and spatial arrangement of the list. The
cover bifolio is in poor condition, and the two folios are nearly torn apart.
printer’s copy comprises 12 pages divided into three bifolios, all of the same paper type (No. 8a, 26-staff). The loose-leaf title page and instrumentation list (the latter on the verso of the title page) that introduce “Wiese im Park” are written on a different paper type: No. 7, 22-staff. This title page names the piece individually as “Wiese im Park (Karl Kraus) für Gesang und Orchester,” and then lower on the page as “op. 13 no. 1,” all in dark ink. Both of these titles are crossed out in blue pencil. There is also a large “No. 1” in red pencil in the upper right corner. All writing in the printer’s copy of “Wiese im Park,” including the text of the vocal line, is in black ink, except for red ink that was used to number every fifth measure and blue pencil that appears occasionally for minor non-musical corrections (such as scratching out the parentheses around Karl Kraus’s name on page 1).

The black ink of the manuscript’s primary layer necessitated hard erasure, and the resulting scars and small holes on every page provide ample evidence of extensive revisions. Many corrections are limited to the seemingly inevitable dynamic and articulation changes, but the heaviest erasure and overwriting resulted from a significant reorchestration in the final layers of the manuscript. Much of the erasure is complete, but comparison with the revision score reveals that Webern first created a printer’s copy of “Wiese im Park” that was practically identical to the revision draft, including the doubled low strings. At some later time he substantially reorchestrated the work, paring the ensemble down to 13 instruments, including only one of each string instrument, and redistributing musical material throughout the score. The instrument list that

---

62 The first page of each bifolio bears the purple ink stamp of the Universal Edition Archive.

63 This title page is the first side of a bifolio that includes an instrumentation list on side 2 (page 1 verso) and is blank on sides 3 and 4 (page 2 recto and verso, respectively).

64 The vocal text in the printer’s copies of op. 13 nos. 2 and 3 is in red ink, and color pencils were used to bracket together the instrumental groups. These two items also use the same paper type: J.E. & Co. No. 5, 18-staff.

65 The cello and double bass parts that were removed were not always the second parts;
accompanied the “Wiese im Park” printer’s score (on the verso side of the title page) was created before this reorchestration, so it calls for two cellos and double basses. Like the title page, the entire obsolete instrumentation list is crossed out. Apparently, the reorchestration was undertaken very late in the compositional process, perhaps one of the last tasks completed before the composer’s diary entry of 31 January 1925 proclaimed the revision complete.66 Since op. 13 nos. 2 and 4 use four solo strings and the third song is scored for only three, without double bass, the reduction to four string soloists in “Wiese im Park” seems to have been motivated by practical considerations.

**Piano-Voice Reduction: Sketches**

Webern dated the sketches for the piano-voice reduction of *Four Songs*, op. 13, now archived in the PSS, as “February 1924.” This date appears on the labeled bifolio into which he placed all four sets of reduction sketches.67 It seems that the cover bifolio succeeded in protecting its contents; the sketches are in fair to good condition and are quite legible, whereas the cover bifolio itself is torn, stained, and in otherwise very poor condition. The sketch manuscripts consist of four loose-leaf sheets of three different

---

66 According to an entry on page 20 of Webern’s Diary No. 6, he completed the revision of *Two Songs*, op. 8, and *Four Songs*, op. 13, on 31 January 1925. See also Friedrich Wildgans, *Anton Webern*, 95.

67 The cover bifolio is 20-staff music paper and is blank except for the title and date on side 1. The autograph inscription on the title page is “Skizzen / Klavierauszüge / der / 4 Orchesterlieder op. 13 / (Februar 1924).” This title was written in green pencil, except for the date, which was written with a lead pencil. Green pencil also was used to write the title of each song on the first page of each sketch and to number every page in musical order.
paper types. The order in which Webern sketched on the sheets, as well as the order in which they were microfilmed, is rather convoluted, so Table 5.2 below offers a graphic description. In Table 5.2 the pages are numbered 1 through 4 in an order that is as close as possible to the musical order. As the table shows, the three pages of reduction sketches for “Wiese im Park” and the beginnings of both “Die Einsame” and “In der Fremde” are on two mated half-sheets of 15-staff music paper. Webern ended the three-page reduction sketch of “Wiese im Park” and began “Die Einsame” on the recto side of page 2. He then continued to a new whole sheet of a different paper type and completed the two-page reduction of “Die Einsame.” The piano-voice reduction of “In der Fremde” begins and ends on the versos of pages 2 and 3, respectively. The sketches of the “Ein Winterabend” reduction are on both sides of a single whole sheet of yet another paper type. The reduction sketch of “Die Einsame” begins more than halfway down page 2 recto, indicating that the sketch of “Wiese im Park” was finished before “Die Einsame” was begun. The reduction sketches of “Wiese im Park,” “Die Einsame,” and “In der Fremde” are all similarly interlinked. Webern probably worked on the piano-voice reduction sketches of all four songs at roughly the same time, as the single, approximate date on the cover bifolio indicates. The interlocking layout of the reductions of the first three songs certainly suggests that they were constructed at a single sitting or sequential sittings, although this cannot be verified by the manuscripts in the case of “Ein Winterabend.” The reduction sketch of “Ein Winterabend” exists separately, possibly only because the final page used for “In der Fremde” (page 3 verso, 101-0464) is full.

Except for the thick green pencil that Webern used to enumerate the pages in musical order and underline the individual song titles, all writing within the sketches is in very sharp lead pencil. These manuscript pages are true sketches, and there are many erasures, strike-outs, and multiple layers of corrections. There are no tempo, expressive, or articulation markings, and the text and music of the vocal line are rarely written in. Webern did allow room for the vocal line, but these staves remain almost completely blank. Obviously, Webern used the reduction sketches primarily to work out a clear and efficient way to render the instrumental parts at the piano. The musical content of the
Table 5.2.: Sketches for Four Songs, Op. 13, Piano-Voice Reduction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Paper type</th>
<th>Song title</th>
<th>PSS film</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1r; half sheet</td>
<td>15-staff</td>
<td>“Wiese im Park” begins</td>
<td>101-0467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1v; half sheet</td>
<td>15-staff</td>
<td>“Wiese im Park” continues</td>
<td>101-0468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2r; half sheet</td>
<td>15-staff</td>
<td>“Wiese im Park” ends</td>
<td>101-0469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2v; half sheet</td>
<td>15-staff</td>
<td>“Die Einsame” begins</td>
<td>101-0470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3r; whole sheet</td>
<td>24-staff</td>
<td>“Die Einsame” ends</td>
<td>101-0463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3v; whole sheet</td>
<td>24-staff</td>
<td>“In der Fremde” ends</td>
<td>101-0464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4r; whole sheet</td>
<td>22-staff</td>
<td>“Ein Winterabend” begins</td>
<td>101-0465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4v; whole sheet</td>
<td>22-staff</td>
<td>“Ein Winterabend” ends</td>
<td>101-0466</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

op. 13 piano-voice reduction sketches is different from that of the published version and clearly demonstrates that it is a reduction of the version in the revision score, not of the printer’s copy.

Piano-Voice Reduction: Fair Copy

The final task facing Webern before publishing Four Songs, op. 13, was the creation of the piano-voice reduction of the final version of the work. The fair copy of this reduction is archived in the PSS; it is the only such copy known and may have served as the printer’s copy. The formal title page, written with purple pencil in a calligraphic script, suggests that the composer intended the manuscript to serve this purpose. Unlike others of Webern’s fair copies, the music of this manuscript was not written in ink but with a regular lead pencil; a red pencil was used to write a title on the first page of each

68 Also on this page are sketches for “In der Fremde” mm. 14-15, measures that appear on page 2 verso (101-0470).

69 The manuscript consists of 20 pages (101-0443 through 0459) in five bifolios (including the cover bifolio) of the same paper type: No. 4, 16-staff. As already mentioned, other printer’s copies are archived in the Pierpont Morgan Library and bear the stamp of the Universal Edition Archive.

70 Manuscript 101-0443 is the first page of the cover/title bifolio that is blank on the other three sides.
reduction, and a light purple pencil (probably the same used for the title page) was used to write the composer’s name, the vocal text, and many dynamic and expressive markings. There are numerous complete erasures in the manuscript, but these corrections are limited to voicing changes between the two hands of the piano and various notational corrections: for example, adjusting the height of slurs or the placement of expressive symbols. Since there are no intermediate sketches between the rather cursory piano-reduction sketches previously discussed and the fair copy, Webern must have worked out all the final details of the reduction while constructing the fair copy—thus, his choice of pencil as a writing medium. The final result is a version of the piano-voice reduction that is identical to the published version, except for minor notational details, changes which may have been made by the publisher.

**Analysis of “Wiese im Park, Op. 13 No. 1**

As mentioned previously (see p. 321 n. 66), according to an inscription in Webern’s Diary No. 6, the final revisions of “Wiese im Park” were completed by the end of January 1925, and the piece was turned over to Universal Edition the following month, along with the two chamber songs on poems by Rainer Maria Rilke, op. 8. “Wiese im Park” was published as the first of the *Four Songs*, op. 13, the following year, both in its full scoring and as a piano/voice reduction. The op. 13 collection was dedicated to Dr. Norbert Schwarzmann, a nerve specialist who generously supported Schoenberg, Berg, and Webern, and whose home was occasionally a venue for performances of their works, most notably during the spring of 1924.\(^7^1\) Op. 13 was premiered in Winterthur, Switzerland, in a concert sponsored by that city’s Collegium Musicum under the direction of Hermann Scherchen on 16 February 1928.\(^7^2\)

---

\(^7^1\)Moldenhauer, *Chronicle*, 257-58.

\(^7^2\)Ibid., 267.
Webern’s only published setting of a Kraus poem, “Wiese im Park” is scored for soprano voice and thirteen instruments: flute, clarinet, bass clarinet, horn, trumpet, trombone, celesta, harp, glockenspiel, violin, viola, cello, and double bass. Comprising 51 measures (102 beats) at a generally slow tempo, this song is one of the composer’s longest compositions, requiring more than two minutes to perform. Like both earlier, fragmentary versions of “Wiese im Park,” the published version begins in 3/4 meter, although the meter changes several times during the course of the work. As opposed to the regular pulse of the piano/voice fragment, the final version adopted the displaced polyrhythmic figures of the most fragmentary of the earlier versions (101-0502), thereby effectively undermining any sensation of regular pulse. Moldenhauer commented on the “increasing use of triplet rhythms” in his description of the op. 13 songs, and in “Wiese im Park” these triplet figures are frequently juxtaposed with duplet figures and displaced by intermittent rests, thus establishing timelessness as a central theme of the work.

Example 5.12 provides a condensed score of the first two measures of the published version. The piece begins with a g<1-a1 trill in the cello that diminishes from piano to pianissimo in the first two beats. This trill continues throughout the first phrase of the vocal line, “Wie wird mir Zeitlos” (How timeless [it] becomes to me), thus presenting a constant arhythmic element, suggesting by its stasis the sense of timelessness articulated in the text. The pitch class G<, often appearing as g<1, is an important element at crucial points in the work; in later passages this pitch class is often heard as an

73 Most recordings of the orchestral song require approximately 2’15”.

74 Chronicle, 267. In the same sentence Moldenhauer also commented on the “greater polyphonic density” of these songs, a characteristic that is most pronounced in “Wiese im Park” after m. 21.

75 Excerpts from the published version of Anton Webern’s “Wiese im Park,” op. 13 no. 1, appear with the kind permission of Universal Edition, Vienna. Copyright Universal Edition A.G., Wien/UE 12460. All rights reserved. In order to reduce clutter in the music examples, these excerpts in condensed score do not include all of the numerous dynamics and other expressive markings that appear in the published score.
isolated tone or as the first and/or last pitch class of linear gestures. As in the opening cello trill, pc G< is often paired in later measures with pc A to form an isolated vertical or linear dyad. Against the static background of the cello trill the staccato and pianissimo celesta tetrachord on m. 1 beat 2 cannot impart a sense of pulse, and if the following three eighth notes of the vocal entrance establish a point of temporal reference, it is quickly dispelled by the offset triplet figure in the strings on beat 3, the rhythmic augmentation of the vocal line in m. 2, and the ritardando that begins late in m. 1 and continues through the end of the phrase. Both the vocal melody and the tetrachord played by the winds on the downbeat of m. 2 decrescendo from pianissimo to the vanishing point, with durations that were carefully constructed so that the last sounds heard before the caesura are the vocal c<1 and the cello trill, then the cello trill alone, making the cello both the first and last sound heard in the first two measures of the work. This timbral frame is the first of many that appear in this piece. The caesura after the first vocal phrase further emphasizes
the sense of timelessness, the halting both of time and the forward progress of the poetic persona.

Like both earlier, fragmentary versions of “Wiese im Park,” several horizontal figures in the opening measures of op. 13 no. 1 form octatonic sets that emphasize the CIII octatonic collection. In his analysis of select passages (mm. 1-2 and 8-12) from “Wiese im Park” Allen Forte has suggested that the octatonic pitch collections were the primary pitch resource in the composition of this work, concluding that “the two short excerpts from the song demonstrate Webern’s refinement of octatonic design to emphasize set replication.” The graphic example from Forte’s analysis of the opening two measures of op. 13 no. 1 is reproduced as Example 5.13. As in the fragmentary sketch of “Wiese im Park” 101-0502, a subset of the CIII octatonic collection is formed by the first five pitches of the vocal line. In 101-0502 the first vocal phrase formed a 5-16 CIII set (see Example 5.2), and in the final version the setting of the same text forms a 4-18 CIII. In contrast, the piano/voice version strongly emphasized CIII only in the instrumental introduction, whereas the first vocal line of that version constituted the non-octatonic 4-6 pc set. As Example 5.13 demonstrates, in the published version the tetrachord in the winds on the downbeat of m. 2 is also a form of the 4-18 CIII set, sharing pcs C and E with the vocal figure. The CII octatonic collection is represented by the 4-Z15 CII set played by the celesta on beat 2 of m. 1, yet the 4-16 set played by the strings is not octatonic. Forte’s analysis incorporates the 4-16 set into the larger octatonic structure in the manner shown. Forte points out that the Webern occasionally chose to highlight non-octatonic sonorities in an otherwise octatonic context, and that the 4-16 set was a sonority that he frequently chose for this purpose. Despite the coincidence of having two 4-18 CIII sets as one horizontal (opening vocal figure) and one vertical (wind tetrachord, m. 2 beat 1) figure in the first two measures, in the following measures non-

76 *The Atonal Music of Anton Webern*, 284.

77 Ibid., 283.

78 Ibid.
octatonic sonorities far outnumber the octatonic ones, contradicting Forte’s thesis with regard to this particular work. In the non-octatonic and often extremely chromatic context that follows, it is the occasional octatonic figure that is anomalous. The fact that octatonic sonorities were prominent in the earlier versions of “Wiese im Park” invites an octatonic analysis of Webern’s compositional approach, yet viewed in the larger context of the complete work, other considerations, primarily the illustrative setting of the text and the creation of cellular motivic connections, seem to have been more central to Webern’s compositional approach.

Although the opening vocal figure of the final version shares an octatonic origin and two pcs with that of 101-0502, the contour and rhythm of this line resembles most that of the fragmentary setting for voice and piano. A comparison of the first vocal phrase in the published version of “Wiese im Park” and both fragmentary versions is provided as Example 5.14. The unidirectional, downward contour of the vocal line in mm. 1-2 is most similar to the contour of the vocal line of 101-0503, which moves steadily downward until the rising tritone between b= and e on “Zeitlos.” The word
Example 5.14: “Wiese im Park,” op. 13 no. 1, mm. 1-2, alternate settings of the first poetic phrase

“zeitlos” is set to a tritone in the final version, as well. The rhythmic pattern of 101-0503 is also more like that of op. 13 no. 1; the two rhythms are identical except for the first note, which is a quarter note in 101-0503 and an eighth note in the published version. All three versions of the first vocal phrase have a downward ic 1 between the two notes setting “wird mir” (101-0502 and 101-0503 are the same pitches, b−1−a). The vocal lines of the final version and 101-0503 also share the important motive of pitch class repetition; the opening vocal phrase of 101-0503 repeats pc B at the octave, and the final version repeats pc C< in similar fashion. The repetition of pitches in the vocal line within very few beats is an important unifying motive in the published version of “Wiese im Park,” as is also demonstrated in the second vocal phrase.

Example 5.15 provides a condensed score of mm. 3-6 of op. 13 no. 1. After the caesura at the end of m. 2, the next brief phrase, mm. 3-4, sets the remainder of poetic line 1, “Rückwärts hingebannt” (held back), to a variety of instrumental and vocal figures that illustrate the idea of looking back or perhaps a disorientation between the past and present. The vocal setting of “Rückwärts hingebannt” is a slurred, five-note figure that
both opens and closes on the pitch f, illustrating the confusion of beginning and end. Beneath the sustained d harmonic in the double bass the high strings also illustrate this image by playing short palindromes (violin e=g=e and viola e-f-e) at the bridge, oscillating simply between two pitches and forming parallel chromatic dyads. The use of palindromes to illustrate “Rückwärts hingebackt” originally arose in the fragmentary piano/voice version of the song. The final string note of this phrase, the c played by the cello and marked “espressivo” in m. 4 (staff 2), completes the chromatic 6-1 pc set (pcs C=D E=F G=) formed by the strings in this phrase. Although the two-note linear figures of the violin and viola could, of course, be assigned to octatonic collections, they do not belong to the same collection, and the overall sonic effect is clearly chromatic.

The clarinet countermelody in mm. 3-4 (lower voice, staff 3), which was marked Hauptstimme in the revision score and constitutes the longest non-vocal melody in the setting of the first stanza, also forms a purely chromatic 5-1 set (pcs A=B C=), although octave displacement obscures the interval profile. Like the vocal setting of “Rückwärts hingebackt,” the clarinet figure in its entirety is not a true palindrome, but the palindromic principle played a role in its construction. The first three pitches, two slurred
together and the third marked legato, form another short ic 1 palindrome, b¹-b⁰=-b¹, obviously related to those in the high strings, and the final linear tetrachord of the clarinet figure (slurred together) begins and ends on the same pitch, c¹. If the clarinet figure is extended to include the linear dyad of the trumpet in m. 4, then the composite linear figure begins and ends with the pitch b¹ followed by the pc B⁰. To draw a relationship between the clarinet and trumpet figures is not unreasonable, since the linear dyad of the trumpet is also marked *Hauptstimme* in the revision score. The *Nebenstimme* of this phrase, the celesta line that begins with the c<3/d³ trill on m. 2 beat 2, is the only figure in the second phrase that is not palindromic on some level. Like all of the chords and linear motives in the second phrase, this countermelody is not octatonic, forming a 5-21 set (6-Z19 including the d³ of the trill, shown in a labeled box in Example 5.15). The celesta figure is also related both by timbre and intervalllic characteristics to the celesta chord in m. 1. The interval profile of the 4-Z15 CII celesta tetrachord in m. 1 (shown in Example 5.13) contains a perfect fourth (ic 5) between the c¹ and f¹ of the lower dyad and a major third (ic 4) between the b¹ and e² of the upper dyad, and in mm. 3-4 the interval-class pattern of the celesta melody is 5-4-5-4.

In the near silence at the end of m. 4, the voice’s rhythmically isolated g¹-g⁰ on “weil’ ich” (I tarry) is clearly discernible as an overlapping sequence of the b¹-b⁰ in the trumpet, and the effect is definitely cadential. The ritardando on the last beat of m. 4 provides another temporal effect, creating a pause to illustrate the word “weilen.” The carefully constructed rhythm on the last syllable of “hingebannt” (dotted eighth note followed by the sixteenth rest that coincides with the trumpet’s entrance) insures that the vocal pitch does not overlap the trumpet’s b¹ [d¹], yet the rhythmic momentum of the second phrase and the motivic connection between the previous clarinet figure and the trumpet’s linear dyad links all of mm. 3-4 into a single phrase. This reading contradicts the lineation of the poem by linking the last two words of line 2 with the first two words of line 3, but there is no punctuation between the lines, and such a reading does not violate the sense of the text. Given the ritardando at the end of m. 4 and the rests on the downbeat of m. 5 in every part except the harp, which enters for the first time with one of
only two quintuplets in the song, a performance that links all of mm. 3-4 in a single phrase not only seems well-founded but may more accurately reflect the composer’s sensitive reading of the poem. 79

The third phrase of the work, m. 5 through beat 2 of m. 6, sets the remainder of poetic line 3 while continuing to transform motives that were modeled by earlier figures. With the resumption of the original tempo at the beginning of m. 5, the harp quintuplet begins and ends with the interval classes modeled by the celesta figures of mm. 1 and 3, leaping downward in the interval-class pattern 4-3-6-5. 80 The vocal figure that sets “und stehe fest” (g<1-a<1-c<1-b<1), once again connected with a slur, begins on cp G< and comprises four of the five pcs that constituted the clarinet figure of mm. 3-4 (b<1=b<1-c<1-a<1=a<1-c<1); the single cello pitch in m. 5 staff 2 (b=), provides the pc that completes the 5-1 set. Along with the cello b=, the other simultaneous, single pitches in the horn, bass clarinet, and trombone form the first significant octatonic set from the CI collection, a 4-27 CI set, shown with a labeled bracket in Example 5.15. Although this small group of pitches is clearly octatonic, these pitches also reproduce a pattern of major third (ic 4) and perfect fourth (ic 5) intervals that has already appeared as a basic chordal and linear motive in the piece; the a= of the bass clarinet is ic 4 from the e<1 of the horn and ic 5 from the c< of the trombone. The first entrance of the glockenspiel on f<2 at the end of m. 5 is ic 5 above the c< of the trombone, and the figure then descends ic 1 from f<2 to f< and ends in a descent of ic 5 from f<2 to c<. Against this sparse glockenspiel countermelody, the second half of the third vocal phrase begins once again on g<1. Interestingly, the return of this important pitch at this point once again juxtaposes g<1 with pc F<, just as occurred very briefly when the voice first entered on g<1 against the

79 On the first page of the fragmentary piano/voice version of “Wiese im Park,” “weil’ ich” is more rhythmically isolated than in the published version, yet the dyad is linked to the setting of “Rückwärts hingebannt” by the a-c<1-f<1 triad that underlies both subphrases. See Example 5.3, mm. 5-7.

80 The first two intervals of the harp figure also continue the pattern of descending ic 4 intervals generated by the cross-relationship of the linear dyads at the end of m. 4: b<1-g< and b=1-g=1 between the trumpet and voice.
fleeting $F^{<}$ of the harp quintuplet. The vocal line setting “im Wiesenplan,” which ultimately moves from the starting pitch down to $c^{<1}$ ($g^{<1-d^{2}-f^{<1-c^{<1}}}$) is also related to the tetrachord played by the strings at the end of m. 1; both figures are 4-16 pc sets that share the pcs $C^{<}$ and $F^{<}$. The 4-16 set is shown by a labeled rectangular box in the vocal line in Example 5.15.

A condensed score of “Wiese im Park” mm. 6-9 is offered as Example 5.16. In the fourth vocal phrase, setting poetic line 3, “wie in den grünen Spiegel hier der Schwan” is declaimed rapidly against extremely quiet (ppp) instrumental effects in the high woodwinds, harp, and viola. In m. 7 the pitch $g^{<1}$ makes another prominent appearance, this time flutter-tongued and sustained by the flute. The widely-spaced figures of the clarinet, harp and viola, grouped as three attacks interspersed by rests, are comparable to the separated figure played by the glockenspiel in mm. 5-6. The scoring and rhythmic coordination of the instruments in mm. 7-8 is idiosyncratic and creates an engaging timbral effect. The harp doubles the first pitch of each clarinet dyad at the octave below, then the viola rapidly strums the clarinet’s second pitch. In the fragmentary piano/voice setting of “Wiese im Park” Webern used palindromes and two linear dyads in contrary motion to reflect the word “Spiegel” (see Example 5.6) but the only palindromes in mm. 7-8 of the final version are the $e^{1}-c^{1}-e^{1}$ that are the lower pitches of the clarinet dyads and the parallel $e-c-e$ in the harp. These figures are, of course, related to the palindromic, linear trichords in the strings near the word “Rückwärts” in mm. 3-4. The six pitches played by the instruments in mm. 7-8 form a 6-Z19 set that shares pcs $G^{<} E A C^{<}$ with the 6-Z19 celesta figure in mm. 3-4. Without the flute $g^{<1}$, however, the pitches in the paired clarinet figures form a 5-16 CIII set. Both of these sets are shown in Example 5.17. Against this sparse and largely octatonic background, the vocal line provides a non-octatonic melody that contains the chromatic series pcs $G^{=} G^{=} A^{=} A B^{=}$. The only octatonic sets of more than three adjacent pitches that can be parsed in this vocal line are the 4-9 CII and 4-Z15 CI sets shown in Example 5.17. More interesting is the 5-7 set that is formed by the slurred pitches that set “in den grünen Spiegel.” This set also appears vertically in mm. 1 and 9, as will be discussed below.
The 5-7 set is not shown in Example 5.13. It consists of pcs B C C< F F< in normal order.

In The Atonal Music of Anton Webern, 284-85, Forte also analyzed mm. 8-12 of op. 13 no. 1 as fundamentally octatonic.
Forte pointed out that the celesta’s linear hexachord in m. 11 is not an octatonic set in its entirety, but that the celesta pitches d<sup>2</sup>-g<sup>1</sup>-c<sup>2</sup>-f<sup>2</sup> and the cello’s b<sup>=3</sup> (sustained in mm. 12-14) combine to create a 5-32 CIII, the last four pitches of which form another instance of the 4-18 CIII set, which appears twice earlier in mm. 1-2. Forte also pointed out that the violin dyad of m. 9 (g-f<sup>2</sup>) combined with the trumpet c<sup>1</sup> and double bass a<sup>2</sup> in m. 10 forms another 4-18 CIII. See The Atonal Music of Anton Wbern, 284-85.

Example 5.17: “Wiese im Park,” op. 13 no. 1, mm. 6-7, pitch class set analysis

F, D<sup><</sup> and the pitch b<sup>1</sup> with the celesta tetrachord in m. 1. The rapid figure of m. 11 is also so situated, after an eighth- and a sixteenth-rest, as barely to overlap the e<sup>1</sup> sung by the voice at the end of the first stanza. Then on the downbeat of m. 12 the cello is heard alone very briefly before the harp enters, again after an eighth- and a sixteenth-rest. This arrangement of timbres reverses the order heard at the beginning of the work, where the cello was the first sound heard, the celesta the second, and the voice the third. As was mentioned in the earlier discussion of the continuity draft, the celesta chord of m. 1 was originally orchestrated for high woodwinds (two flutes, E= clarinet, and bass clarinet, as shown in Example 5.8). Perhaps one of the reasons that the composer changed the orchestration of this chord was to achieve the timbral framing of the song’s first section.

The six-note celesta figure in m. 11 marks the beginning of the instrumental interlude in mm. 11-14 that separates the setting of the poem’s first stanza, constituting

---

83Forte pointed out that the celesta’s linear hexachord in m. 11 is not an octatonic set in its entirety, but that the celesta pitches d<sup>&lt;2</sup>-g<sup>&lt;1</sup>-c<sup>&lt;2</sup>-f<sup>&lt;2</sup> and the cello’s b<sup>=3</sup> (sustained in mm. 12-14) combine to create a 5-32 CIII, the last four pitches of which form another instance of the 4-18 CIII set, which appears twice earlier in mm. 1-2. Forte also pointed out that the violin dyad of m. 9 (g-f<sup>&lt;</sup>) combined with the trumpet c<sup>1</sup> and double bass a<sup>2</sup> in m. 10 forms another 4-18 CIII. See The Atonal Music of Anton Wbern, 284-85.
The second stanza is, of course, both a description of nature and a contemplation of the self, for the meadow (nature) is the green mirror on which the swan (the poetic persona) is reflected.

Example 5.18: “Wiese im Park,” op. 13 no. 1, mm. 9-14, condensed score

The song’s Part A, from the setting of the second stanza in Part B, mm. 14-37. The change of meter in m. 11 from 3/4 to 3/8 is one indication of this formal subdivision. The music in and after m. 11 is also much more animated than Part A, as is designated by the performance direction *Lebhaft* (lively) and a doubling of the basic pulse from quarter notes at 60 beats per minute to eighth notes at 120. The abrupt transition in m. 11, which clearly delineates the setting of the middle stanza from the earlier music, not only reflects the stanzaic structure of the poem but also the change of perspective and mood that is implicit in the text. In contrast to the poem’s first stanza, during which the poetic persona focuses on himself in relation to his surroundings, using the first person pronouns “mir,” “ich,” and “mein,” in the second stanza the poem is a description of natural phenomena viewed in a timeless state. Although the term does not appear in the poem, the second

---

84 The second stanza is, of course, both a description of nature and a contemplation of the self, for the meadow (nature) is the green mirror on which the swan (the poetic persona) is reflected.
In English these flowers, of which there are several varieties, are called bluebells. A common European variety, *Scilla nonscripta*, has grasslike leaves and a one-sided cluster of bell-shaped, blue-violet flowers.

During the instrumental interlude in mm. 11-14 the leaping, syncopated instrumental motives, scored in the bell-like timbres of the celesta and glockenspiel, along with harp, anticipate the textual reference to "Die vielen Glockenblumen" (literally, the many bellflowers) in mm. 16-17. Again, as in the instrumental introduction, the important G<e-A miniature motive, first heard in the cello trill of m. 1, chimes three times in mm. 12-14 as grace note a<1 moves to g<2 in the celesta. The linear and vertical dyads in the celesta are also related both by rhythm and interval to the leaping clarinet figures in mm. 7 and 8. Each linear and vertical dyad in these two passages comprises either a perfect fourth or ic 1. The celesta and glockenspiel figures in mm. 12-14 are also palindromes; in the celesta the a<1-g<2 linear dyads occur at the beginning, middle and end of the figure, with b<1-g<2 dyads in between, and the glockenspiel line of mm. 13-14 is c<2-d<1-c<2-d<1-c<2. The succession of dyads in the harp’s bass clef is not a strict palindrome, although it is highly repetitive, both beginning and ending with a vertical dyad (g-e<1 in m. 12 and b=-e=1 in m. 14) on either side of the tremolos. The bell-like instrumental figures of mm. 12-14 are heard against the background of a sustained harmonic in the cello, which plays b=3. This figure may be related both to the isolated b= that the cello played in m. 5 and, even more strongly, to the sustained harmonic (d<1) played by the

---

85 In English these flowers, of which there are several varieties, are called bluebells. A common European variety, *Scilla nonscripta*, has grasslike leaves and a one-sided cluster of bell-shaped, blue-violet flowers.

86 The pitches of the harp figure in mm. 12-14 comprise a 4-26 CIII set.
In mm. 12-13 the celesta, harp, and glockenspiel provide every pc except pcs F and F<. The violin completes the aggregate with the first two pitches of m. 14. The celesta flourish in m. 11, however, must be ignored if the instrumental interlude is to be analyzed as an aggregate, so the pattern is probably coincidental.

Both of these figures are, of course, the same 5-7 set, a set that was heard previously in the voice in m. 7, where the pcs A=D E= (a=1-d2-e=1 in m. 7) were also sequential.
The C₁ is the lowest pitch on a double bass equipped either with five strings or with the extension and key-operated mechanism described in Hector Berlioz’s instrumentation manual. See Berlioz, *Treatise on Instrumentation*, 97. As mentioned previously, the last pitch of the “Vallorbe” continuity draft may also require a double bass capable of reaching C₁, although that pitch is not entirely clear in the manuscript. See pp. 154-55 and n. 63.

Example 5.19: “Wiese im Park,” op. 13 no. 1, mm. 15-19, condensed score

simulates the poetic persona overwhelmed by the grandeur of the natural environs. In the hush that follows, the double bass softly furnishes a low, rumbling C₁ that is sustained through m. 19—a true pedal tone, as opposed to the sustained harmonics of mm. 3-4 and 12-14. Above this pedal tone the voice quietly intones “Horch und schau” (listen and look), once again ending the phrase on pc G<, one octave below the first note of the phrase. The clarinet countermelody in mm. 18-19, which imitates the disjunct contour and lilting rhythmic pattern of the string figures in mm. 14-16, is not a literal palindrome, although, like the vocal figure in this phrase, it begins and ends on the same pc, with the

---

89 The C₁ is the lowest pitch on a double bass equipped either with five strings or with the extension and key-operated mechanism described in Hector Berlioz’s instrumentation manual. See Berlioz, *Treatise on Instrumentation*, 97. As mentioned previously, the last pitch of the “Vallorbe” continuity draft may also require a double bass capable of reaching C₁, although that pitch is not entirely clear in the manuscript. See pp. 154-55 and n. 63.
latter falling one octave below (b¹ to b). In these same measures the harp plays a simple palindrome that oscillates between a and b=, rhythmically expanding the motive of short, two-pitch palindromes heard earlier. After the harp’s last a, the glockenspiel figure immediately picks up the pattern in m. 19, starting with b¹ an octave above that of the harp line. The glockenspiel figure in mm. 19-20 (continued in Example 5.20) is not a literal palindrome either, but like many other figures it is palindromic on the level of interval-class sequence: 1-6-1. With the exception of the descending glockenspiel figure the brief instrumental interlude in mm. 20-21 comprises only three dyads, one of which is yet another pairing of the pitches G< and A, this time sounding as a= -a¹ in the bass clarinet. This interlude is marked by another ritardando and reduction to a very sparse texture.

In contrast to the clamor of mm. 11-17, the setting of poetic line 6 begins in near silence and is characterized by a gradual increase in polyphonic density, ranging from the initial entrance of the voice alone in m. 21 to the five-voice counterpoint of mm. 24-25. The vocal setting of “Wie lange steht er schon” (how long it stays) illustrates the word “lange” in long tones in mm. 22-23, and in m. 24 the lilting rhythm of “steht er” is transferred to the clarinet (staff 2) and trombone (staff 5). The viola countermelody beginning in m. 22 staff 4, the first two pitches (d-g) of which were drawn from the isolated g¹-d¹ dyad played by the strings in m. 20, provides a more rhythmically agitated and disjunct melodic line, the rhythms and general contour of which influenced the form of the bass clarinet melody in mm. 23-25 staff 3. This bass clarinet countermelody was designated as a Nebenstimme in the “Wiese im Park” revision score, as were the parallel clarinet and trombone lines beginning in m. 24. The viola and bass clarinet lines also share a rather aurally obscure interval-class relationship: the first five pitches of the viola in mm. 22-24 move in the ic pattern 5-4-3-4, and in mm. 23-26 the second through sixth pitches of the bass clarinet melody move in the same interval-class pattern, 5-4-3-4.

90 In the revision score there are a great many Hauptstimme and Nebenstimme markings in mm. 23-37, much more than in the music before or after, thus testifying to the essentially contrapuntal nature of this passage.
Example 5.20: “Wiese im Park,” op. 13 no. 1, mm. 20-26, condensed score

A clearer and more audible relationship exists between the bass clarinet in m. 23 and the violin line in mm. 25 staff 4, both of which contain the linear trichord $f^1-b^1-g^1$ as the second, third and fourth pitches in their respective lines. In the bass clarinet line this linear trichord is followed by the pitches $a-d^1$, and immediately after the $f^1-b^1-g^1$ of the violin (m. 25) that instrument rests on the downbeat of m. 26 while the vocal line provides $a^1-c^{<2}$. The composer clearly wished the four-note violin figure in m. 25 to be emphasized in performance, as is indicated by the *Hauptstimme* symbol that he wrote above the figure in the revision score. Although rhythmically quite different, the violin part of m. 25 is even more audibly related to the following trumpet figure in m. 26, which the composer also marked as *Hauptstimme*. Both of these linear tetrachords begin with the pitches $b-f^1-b^1$. The trumpet figure in m. 26 is also emphasized by the cleverly constructed rhythmic pattern that syncopates three of the four attacks (all but $g^1$ on beat 2) against the straight eighth- and quarter-note rhythms of the voice, bass clarinet and strings.
Example 5.21 provides a condensed score version of Wiese im Park” mm. 26-37. The setting of “auf diesem Stein,” the end of poetic line 6, in mm. 26-27 is characterized by several short, staccato motives that contrast sharply with the slurred and sustained melodic figure that sets the first part of that poetic line. The three staccato eighth notes that set “auf diesem” in m. 26 are related by rhythm and articulation to the viola’s descending trichord in m. 24; both figures also end in large downward leaps (an augmented fifth in the viola, m. 24 and a major sixth in the voice, m. 26). In m. 27 of the revision score the composer placed Nebenstimme symbols above the horn’s linear dyad (staff 2 of Example 5.21), d=¹-c¹, and at the beginning of the long cello countermelody (staff 5) that begins with separated dotted-sixteenth notes and continues through the downbeat of m. 31. The Hauptstimme in this passage is the viola melody in mm. 27-28 staff 4, which also begins with three descending staccato notes. The first two pitches of this viola melody, a=²-c², are the same two pcs played in m. 24 at the end of the previous viola line.¹ In mm. 28-29 staff 3 the descending trumpet figure extends the basic motive of three descending, staccato pitches to four, while also elaborating on the two-pitch palindromes heard several times earlier in the work, continuing beyond the initial pitch class to create the following pattern: c²-c²-b=¹-b=¹-c¹-c¹-d¹-d¹. In the same two measures the violin line moves in homorhythm with the trumpet part, traversing an octave to finish on the same pc on which the line started: a¹-a¹-f<¹-f<¹-g<⁸-g<⁸-a-a-a. Against the strong triple meter of these staccato figures in m. 28, the first three syllables of poetic line 7, “der Admiral” are set as hemiola. This is one of the few cross-rhythms in this section of the piece. The basic pulse of the work remains triple from m. 20 through m. 37—the longest passage in the work without a meter change.

During the setting of the last five words of poetic line 7 and all of line 8 the music reaches a peak of both overt chromaticism and polyphonic density. For instance, several

¹On the second beat of m. 27, below the second note (c²) of the viola countermelody, the harp plays an a=-d=¹ dyad, so that all three pcs from the viola line in m. 24 are sounded together. The B= in the cello on m. 27 beat 2 also provides the pc sung by the voice on beats 1 and 2 of m. 24.
Example 5.21: “Wiese im Park,” op. 13 no. 1, mm. 26-37, condensed score
of the shorter linear figures between mm. 29-37 move exclusively by semitones, and most of the others result in x-1 pc sets, providing a chromatic foundation over which the longer melodies and countermelodies intertwine. For instance, the flute figure in mm. 29-31 staff 3 presents the most compact of the chromatic motives, simply oscillating between flutter-tongued \( d^1 \) and \( e^1 \), while in these same measures the horn and double bass (stemmed together in staff 4), both marked “sehr zart” in the printed score and with an identical pattern of rising and falling dynamics, play chromatic melodies in parallel major sevenths. The horn and double bass melodies move by semitone, except for the skip of a minor third between the third and fourth pitches (\( f^4-a^1 \) in the horn and \( f<^1-a^1 \) in the double bass), and both result in 4-1 pc sets. In the continuity draft these two lines were scored for the first and second double basses and were therefore much more closely linked by timbre. This change in scoring was effected in the revision of the printer’s copy. These two parallel lines, as well as the flutter-tongued flute figure, were all marked as *Nebenstimme* in the revision score.\(^92\) In m. 32 the repetitive, staccato figures in the trumpet, celesta, and harp also descend by semitones, as do the cello trills in the same measure (not shown) and the related descending, staccato motives in the flute, clarinet, and horn in mm. 35-37 staff 2.\(^93\) Furthermore, like the chromatic double bass and horn melodies of mm. 29-31, the celesta and cello in m. 32 and the flute and clarinet in mm. 35-37 all move in parallel minor seconds. The interaction of the flute and clarinet lines in

\(^92\)In the revision score one *Nebenstimme* symbol was written above the flute figure and another symbol was written above the first double bass line, although I assume that the latter symbol applied equally to the second double bass part in this passage. It was the first double bass line that was moved to the horn.

\(^93\)In m. 32 the upper three pitches of the three harp dyads form one 3-1 set, and the lower three pitches form another, although the combination of all six pitches is not a chromatic set but a 6-Z6 (pcs A A= G E E= D in normal order).

It is difficult to render the complex rhythmic relationships of the various elements of m. 32 in a condensed score, and there is one figure in the printed score that does not appear in Example 5.21. In m. 32 the cello plays three trilled eighth notes, \( a^1/b^1-a^1/b<^1-g^1/a^1 \). The intense erasure in this measure in both the sketch and fair copy manuscripts of the piano-voice reduction reveals that Webern labored over the reduction of this measure as well. The solution he reached in the fair copy also left out the cello trills.
mm. 35-37 is particularly interesting, for they trade the pcs G and A= back and forth throughout the six-beat pattern, clearly emphasizing the G-A= dyad.\textsuperscript{94} In m. 37, the end of the song’s middle section, most of the instruments resolve downward by semitone (the violin moves down a major second, and the trombone reiterates g=), and the two-note trumpet figure, which was marked Hauptstimme in the revision score and is marked espressivo in the published version, provides the linear dyad a=\textsuperscript{-1}-g\textsuperscript{1} yet again.

Against the chromatic harmonic foundation furnished by the background voices in mm. 29-37, the principal and secondary melodic figures emerge as notably long, more disjunct, and slightly less chromatic themes. Noting the length and lyrical interest of the expansive melodic figures played by the cello (mm. 27-31 staff 5), clarinet (mm. 29-34 staff 2), bass clarinet (mm. 31-34 staff 5), and violin (mm. 33-36 staff 3),\textsuperscript{95} Webern’s enthusiastic remarks regarding his compositions from the summer of 1917 are easily understood: “Homogeneous sounds, in part long themes, altogether something entirely different from before the war.”\textsuperscript{96} In mm. 29-37 of “Wiese im Park” these “long themes” comprise a relatively small collection of basic motivic cells, the continuous transformation of which often result in distortions of pitch content and intervallic profile. As a result there are very few noteworthy pitch or pc set relationships between the various melodic motives, but there are numerous cellular rhythmic relationships that lend a sense of cohesion throughout the passage. Some of these subtle rhythmic connections are clearly audible, largely due to proximity, as in the rhythmic pattern of three staccato sixteenth-notes that initiates the vocal figure in m. 30 and the bass clarinet figure in m. 31

\textsuperscript{94}In mm. 35-37 the flute figure is a\textsuperscript{=1} a\textsuperscript{=1} g\textsuperscript{1} g\textsuperscript{1} f<\textsuperscript{1} g\textsuperscript{1} and the simultaneous clarinet figure is a\ incidence a< g< g g<.

\textsuperscript{95}The clarinet and bass clarinet countermelodies in mm. 29-34 were labeled as Hauptstimme and Nebenstimme in the revision score, respectively.

\textsuperscript{96}Letter from Webern to Berg, 18 August 1917. Quoted in German in Hilmar, ed., \textit{Anton Webern}, 71. “Geschlossener Klang, lange Themen zum Teil, überhaupt ganz was anderes als vor dem Krieg.”

The melodic lines of the clarinet in mm. 18-20 and the bass clarinet in mm. 23-26, although slightly shorter, should also be viewed in this context.
staff 5. Other motivic relationships, such as the four sixteenth notes in the bass clarinet on beats 2 and 3 of m. 32 and the similar rhythmic figure in the violin at the end of m. 34 staff 3, have been complicated by the inversion of the basic contour and differing patterns of articulation, thus making them more obvious to the analytical eye than to the listening ear. The lilting quarter-note/eighth-note pattern is fairly prevalent and clearly audible, especially when the figure occurs in multiple parts in parallel motion, as in m. 31 between the horn, voice and double bass or in m. 33 between the bass clarinet and viola. Webern also drew an audible connection between the vocal setting of “und alles lautet blau” (poetic line 8) in mm. 32-36 and the earlier vocal setting of “Wie lange steht der schon” (beginning of line 6) in mm. 21-25 (Example 5.20), setting both phrases to an identical rhythm. The two vocal phrases have no intervallic or pc set similarities, but they do share a general contour in the first four pitches of each phrase, and both end on the pitch e<\textsuperscript{1}/d<\textsuperscript{1}. As a result, Part B of “Wiese im Park,” the setting of the poem’s second stanza, is itself divided into two distinct but unequal parts: the picturesque setting of poetic line 7 in mm. 11-20, with its instrumental effects and illustrative depiction of the “Glockenblumen,” and the densely contrapuntal setting of the remainder of the stanza.

As shown in Example 5.22, the setting of the last stanza of Kraus’s poem is preceded by an abrupt transition that is comparable to the similarly abrupt transition between the end of the first stanza and the beginning of the second in mm. 10-11. As in m. 11, the setting of the third stanza is delineated from the previous music by a change of basic pulse—in this case a return to the 3/4 meter of Part A—and a new tempo designation, Langsam and quarter note equals 48 beats per minute. The setting of the poem’s final stanza also begins with a return of the offset triplet rhythm first heard in the cello entrance of m. 1. In m. 38 this sustained motive is presented by muted low string tremolos at the bridge and flutter-tonguing in the flute and trombone, clearly recalling those timbres and instrumental devices used in mm. 3-4 and 7.\textsuperscript{97} The macabre timbre of

\textsuperscript{97}The instrumental chord in m. 38 is also related by pc set to the sonority formed by the celesta tetrachord and trilled cello figure of m. 1. The celesta tetrachord in m. 1 is a 4-Z15 CII set, which can be extended to a 5-32 CII when combined with the principal
the instrumental chord crescendos from pianissimo to forte and beyond in m. 38-39, and the voice enters forte and with a regular rhythmic pulse that is quite unlike the free floating cross rhythms of the opening measures. At the beginning of the last stanza the poetic persona rips himself free of his reverie and therefore becomes once again self-aware and fixed in time. As opposed to the second stanza, in which the vocal line is often only one of several melodies that intertwine polyphonically, at the beginning of the third stanza the first person pronoun returns in the text, “Nicht weiter will ich,” (I wish [to go] no further), and the vocal line stands out as a lone melodic element against a static and sinister background. After “ich” is uttered in m. 39, startling sforzandos, first in the horn pitch of the cello trill ($g^<$). Likewise, the chord formed by the instruments in m. 38, including only the first pitch of the cello tremolo ($g$) is also a 4-Z15 set, here from CI, that when combined with the second cello pitch becomes a 5-32 CI. It may seem a bit contrived to ignore the second note of the cello trill in m. 1, but perhaps no more so than the alternate possibility, that this pc set relationship at this particular point is simply coincidental.
and then in multiple instruments on the downbeat of m. 40, are followed by a commanding cry in the voice, “Eitler Fuß, mach halt!” (Idle foot, halt!”). At the cry to “halt” in m. 41 the instruments swell beyond forte and then cease altogether.

The following measures contain numerous other musical references to the opening measures of the work, as well as allusions to later passages. For instance, in m. 42 the sixteenth-note quintuplet figure scored in the harp is the second of only two quintuplets appearing in the piece; it is therefore very clearly evocative of the harp quintuplet of m. 5 (shown in Example 5.15). Both quintuplets begin with pc F, and both have A as the second pitch and C as the fourth, yet they do not form the same pc set class or share significant interval relationships. The latter quintuplet is also an intervallic palindrome, moving in the pattern up a major third-down a minor ninth-up a major third. In the following measure, shown in Example 5.23, the e²/f² trill of the glockenspiel recalls the trill played by the celesta in m. 3—indeed, the earlier celesta figure contains every pitch class heard in the glockenspiel figure of m. 42—yet the rhythm of the latter figure is a variation of the motive played by the strings in mm. 14-16 (Example 5.19). The glockenspiel motive in m. 42 is also accompanied by tremolos in the double bass and cello, which play d³ and e¹, respectively; in mm. 3-4 (Example 5.15 staves 3 and 4) the double bass played d³ and the violin played e¹, the latter also with tremolo. The bell-like timbre of the glockenspiel in m. 42 also seems purposefully related to the “Glockenblumen” motives of the instrumental interlude in mm. 11-14 (Example 5.18), which introduced the setting of the second stanza. Although the order of their entrances is different from that in mm. 11-14, the harp, glockenspiel, and celesta again comprise three of the primary textural elements in mm. 41-43. Furthermore, in m. 42 the flute

---

98 The melodies in the trombone and double bass that accompany this outburst are related to earlier vocal figures. The trombone plays F< -a=- -g-g= in m. 40 (finishing the line on c on the downbeat of m. 41), whereas the vocal line in m. 30-31 was f< -g< -g< -f<². The first three pitches of the double bass figure in m. 40 are E= -A-A=, as in the vocal melody of m. 7, “in den grü[nen]” set to e¹ -a¹ -a¹.  

99 The celesta figure in mm. 3-4 is c<³/d²,g<¹-e²-a²-f⁹, and the glockenspiel figure in m. 42 is e²/f²-f⁴-c<²-a¹-g<¹.
Example 5.23: “Wiese im Park,” op. 13 no. 1, mm. 42-51, condensed score
plays $b^-$ as the principal pitch of a trill, even as the cello in mm. 12-14 played that pitch as the basis of a $b^-$ harmonic, and in mm. 42-43 staff 3 the trumpet melody is yet another that begins and ends on the same pitch class ($g^{\uparrow} - f^\downarrow - d^\downarrow - f^\downarrow$).

Once the glockenspiel timbre recalls the “Glockenblumen” in m. 42, the poetic persona reacts to this sound, focusing outward once again, and the vocal line ascends to its melodic highpoint, $a^2$, on the first syllable of “Wunder.” This passage makes multiple references both to the setting of “Rückwärts hingebannt” in mm. 3-4 and to the instrumental figures of mm. 12-14 that foreshadowed the reference to “Glockenblumen.” The distinctive, bell-like timbre of the celesta (staff 4) that accompanies the setting of “Wunder” recalls that instrument’s figure in mm. 3-4, as well as the bells of mm. 11-14. The celesta’s first dyad in m. 43, $g^{\downarrow} - c^{\downarrow}$, consists of the first pitch classes played by that instrument in m. 3, and both the celesta and the harp played several perfect fourths in m. 13. As another illustration of the timeless ideal of nature, in m. 42 the vocal line forms a perfectly chromatic pitch class palindrome that once again pairs and emphasizes the pcs $G^{\downarrow}$ and $A$ at both the beginning and end of the melodic phrase ($g^{\downarrow} - a^\uparrow - b^\downarrow - a^\downarrow - a^\downarrow$). These two pitch classes were sounded immediately previously as the middle two pitches of the harp motive in m. 41 ($A - G^{\downarrow}$) and by the last two pitches of the glockenspiel motive in m. 42 ($a^\uparrow - g^{\downarrow}$), which overlaps the beginning of the vocal figure. Pitch class $G^{\downarrow}$ was also emphasized by trumpet figure (staff 3) that accompanies this vocal phrase, which reaches its lowest pitch of $g^{\downarrow}$ just before the soprano sings $a^\uparrow$. The trumpet melody also serves to obscure the rhythmic pulse of the passage, creating hemiolas in mm. 42 and 44 against the duple subdivisions of the other instrumental lines. The syncopated rhythms in the strings and the ritardando in mm. 44-45 also aid in the suspension of pulse.

The violin countermelody that accompanies the setting of “Vor deisem Wunder” has a connection with the vocal setting of “Und dieses war mein Land” in mm. 8-11. Both of these melodies form 6-Z12 sets (not diagramed in the examples) that share the pitch $c^1$ and the pcs D and E. Furthermore, the interval-class pattern that sets “[die]-ses war mein Land” in mm. 9-11 (Example 5.18) is ic 4 down ($b^-$ to $d^1$) followed by ascending semitones; in the violin in mm. 43-44 the interval-class pattern of the last four
notes is also down ic 4 ($e^2$ to $c^2$) followed by ascending semitones that have been displaced by an octave. Although the set class connection is certainly obscure from an aural perspective, when combined with the similar intervallic structure of each figure the connection appears more intentional, suggesting that the composer sought to juxtapose the wonders of nature with the sardonic earlier reference to the homeland.

The end of poetic line 10, “ende deinen Lauf” (end your course), decelerates in m. 44 to a cadence in m. 45, and the poem’s next line, “Ein toter Tag schlägt seine Augen auf” (A dead day opens it eyes), begins at the slow tempo of eighth-notes at 88 beats per minute. In the final three lines of “Wiese im Park” the poetic persona intentionally withdraws from his nostalgic revelry and the encounter with the Ursprung. The pessimistic and macabre image of the poem’s penultimate line, the reawakening of a dead day, asserts the futility of dwelling on the timeless past and the impossibility of summoning the Ursprung in a flawed and decaying world. As opposed to the energetic and dynamic motives that characterized the poem’s second stanza, in the last six measures the rhythmic energy dissipates and the tempo continually decreases. The rhythm of the viola’s melodic figure in m. 46 staff 4 originally appeared in the strings in mm. 15-16 along with setting of “Die vielen Glockenblumen,” but in this last manifestation the motive is articulated differently and moves at less than half the original tempo, plodding wearily under the evocative tempo direction “schleppend” (dragging). As the rhythmic energy of the work dissipates, the predominate direction of every melodic gesture in the last five measures moves downward to an ever slowing and more elongated pulse. The descending staccato figures in m. 48, first associated with the Admiral butterfly, trudge generally downward to yet another ritardando in m. 48. The pitch content of this staccato motive has been altered at every appearance, and in m. 48 the clarinet and bass clarinet trade pitch classes back and forth, again pairing pcs G and A= on beats 2 and 3, much as did the flute and clarinet in mm. 35-37. In m. 49 the performance direction “sehr gedehnt” (very stretched) further suggests weariness and a

---

100 In m. 48 the clarinet line is b-b= -g-a= -g, while the simultaneous bass clarinet figure is B= -B-A= -G-A=.
loss of energy, and in mm. 50-51 the unidirectional trombone melody presents the last intervallic palindrome of the work, moving down a major seventh, down a major third, then again down a major seventh. The last two words of the poem, “so alt,” are separated from the rest of the phrase by an eighth rest, although there is no punctuation at this point in the poem, and the final vocal dyad, f⁴ to b, descends like a sigh to the lowest pitch of the vocal line.¹⁰¹ In the end the poetic persona is resigned to the loss of youth and of the Ursprung, and old age returns as the inevitable triumph of time in a world fallen from grace.

¹⁰¹This is the only appearance of b in the vocal line. The note c⁴ only appears twice before, once in m. 5 on the second syllable of “stehe” and again in m. 48 on “auf” (prefix of separable verb aufschlagen) at the end of the poetic phrase “Ein toter Tag schlägt seine Augen auf.”
CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSIONS

Why Webern Set Kraus’s Poetry

The nearly 70 pages of compositional materials within Webern’s Nachlaß dedicated to settings of Kraus’s poems offer compelling evidence of the composer’s interest in that poetry. Between 1916, when Webern first began to set the Kraus poem “Wiese im Park,” and early 1925, when his setting of this poem reached its final form, the six Kraus poems Webern chose for musical settings outnumber those by any other poet except Trakl, whose texts far outnumber any in Webern’s song oeuvre until the composer turned exclusively to Hildegard Jone in the early 1930s. Webern’s Kraus manuscripts themselves do not, however, address the perennial question of why Webern found these poems so attractive and suitable for musical settings. As has been repeatedly pointed out during this study, the very nature of Webern’s compositional process during his middle period, with its multiple layers of sketching and erasure, obliterates much of the “written history” of that process. In even the clearest of manuscripts, however, the earliest stage of the compositional process, the stage at which a composer selects a text, is the most inaccessible. Perhaps it is ultimately beyond the purview of the historian to answer definitively the question “Why?” yet a review of relevant aspects of Webern’s historical and cultural context offers some evidence to illuminate the composer’s obvious attraction to Kraus’s lyrical verse.

An assessment of Webern’s favorable reaction towards Kraus’s poetry cannot dismiss the satirist’s stature within the Vienna milieu in general and among the Schoenberg circle in particular. Kraus’s profound influence on Webern and his closest
associates is beyond question. The extant correspondence of Schoenberg, Berg, and Webern, as well as the correspondence and memoirs of their compatriots, repeatedly testifies to the high esteem in which Kraus was held and the influence that his aesthetic views exerted on this group. To set the poetry of this eminent, if controversial, figure successfully would have earned the composer a level of prestige and admiration among Webern’s circle of associates. Despite the fact that Kraus’s poetry met with criticism from many of his contemporaries, he was a towering figure on the Viennese intellectual and literary scene, and it is very likely that Webern’s literary tastes were influenced by Kraus’s journal. It is not surprising therefore that Webern would have considered Kraus’s poems as potential sources of song. As a young composer Webern was drawn to many contemporary poets, including, in addition to Kraus, Peter Altenberg, Richard Dehmel, Stefan George, Rainer Maria Rilke, and Georg Trakl. Although he continuously cultivated his knowledge of classical authors and poets, particularly Goethe, and he often set these texts to music, as a young composer Webern clearly wished to identify a significant portion of his own music with current literary trends. As Reinhardt has rightly pointed out in her study of Webern’s Jone manuscripts, despite the fact that Webern scholarship has a long and sordid history of disparaging the composer’s taste in poetic texts, Webern was in fact knowledgeable and independent in his assessment of prose and poetry, and he frequently recommended new works to his colleagues.¹ For instance, the composer began to set Trakl’s poems to music soon after the young poet’s death, even though Trakl had not yet reached wide acclaim. Webern’s multitudinous complete and fragmentary Trakl settings represent the first musical works based on that poet’s verse. Webern also created some of the first settings of Rilke’s poetry, and much later he would champion the works of Hildegard Jone in an even more enthusiastic fashion, even though her work was relatively unknown. Interestingly, Webern’s selections from among Kraus’s poetic oeuvre have perhaps been validated by the fact that several of the poems

¹See “From Poet’s Voice to Composer’s Muse,” 14-15. For an interesting discussion and overview of the decades-long controversy concerning Webern’s literary tastes, particularly as it applies to the reception of his Jone settings, see Reinhardt, 3-17.
he chose have been reprinted in subsequent, selective editions of Kraus’s poetry. “Vallorbe,” “Wiese im Park,” “Vision des Erblindeten,” and “Flieder” were all reprinted in Ausgewählten Gedichte, a collection that Kraus compiled in 1920, as well as in Albert Bloch’s English translations of Kraus poetry, published in 1930. Bloch’s translation of “Wiese im Park” was reprinted in Frederick Ungar’s 1977 compilation of Kraus’s writings, No Compromise: Selected Writings of Karl Kraus, and Max Knight’s translation of this poem was included in Zohn’s In These Great Times: A Karl Kraus Reader. Furthermore, among those modern critics who are sympathetic to Kraus’s poetry, many of these same poems have been repeatedly recommended as exemplifying the best of Kraus’s poetic oeuvre.

Webern’s written reactions to Kraus’s poetry in 1914 clearly indicate that the composer appraised the poems as having artistic value: “I feel that [his] is the most

---

2 An announcement of this publication appears in Die Fackel 552-553 (October 1920): 25.


5 (Montreal: Engendra, 1976), 133.

6 The modern reception of Kraus’s poetry varies considerably from critic to critic, although there is general consensus that Kraus’s lyrical poetry is the most enduring. For example, Edward Timms wrote of the “great lyrical power in such poems as these,” speaking specifically of “Verwandlung,” “Wiese im Park,” “Vor einem Springbrunnen,” and other lyrical poems that appeared in the first volume of Worte im Versen; see Apocalyptic Satirist, 255. Likewise, Erich Heller wrote of Kraus’s “poetic genius”; see The Disinherited Mind, 255. On the negative side, Wilma Abeles Iggers criticizes most of Kraus’s poetry as having no permanent value, due largely to its fixation on contemporaneous personalities and topics, although her comments regarding Kraus’s lyrical works exhibit a myopic view that cannot reconcile the bitterness of his satire with the sensitivity of his poetic expression; see Iggers, Karl Kraus: A Viennese Critic of the Twentieth Century, 12-15. Most recently, Allen Forte wrote the following concerning Kraus’s “Wiese im Park”: “Although Webern obviously found the poem attractive enough to set for voice with orchestral accompaniment, it is not a first-rate specimen compared to the poetry he had set earlier—especially that of Stefan George and Rainer Maria Rilke”; see The Atonal Music of Anton Webern, 282.
magnificent poetry, art.”⁷ Although Webern did not specify which of Kraus’s poems he found to be “herrlichste,” we can deduce from those texts that Webern set to music which of the satirist’s poetic oeuvre the composer found most attractive—or at least which of the poems he found most amenable to musical settings. Much of Kraus’s poetry was satirical and akin to his incisive aphorisms in tone and content, yet Webern selected exclusively those lyrical utterances that stand in stark contrast among the acerbic witticisms and versified polemics that constitute the bulk of Kraus’s poetic oeuvre.

As was discussed in Chapter 2, the natural imagery in “Wiese im Park,” “Vallorbe,” and “Flieder,” all three poems of affirmation expressed in the first person, probably drew Webern to these poems more than any other trait. In these poems the connection between nature and the all-important concept of Ursprung (origin) is either explicit or strongly implied. Kraus’s idea of Ursprung, which constitutes a central theme in much of his discourse, was extremely attractive to Webern, as he revealed in a letter to Schoenberg, written one day after the younger composer had attended a Kraus lecture:

. . . it is a look into the timeless, thence also ahead toward the “origin.” (That is such a wonderful thought by Kraus. He speaks so often of the origin.)⁸

In “Wiese im Park” and “Vallorbe” the Ursprung is inseparably connected with the concept of timelessness and eternity, as well as with the ineffable perfection of original creation. The related concepts of Sonntag and the color blue, both symbolic of divinity and the Ursprung, also appear in these poems. In “Wiese im Park” the bluebells ring and Sunday resounds blue (“Sonntag lautet blau”); in “Flieder” the bluebells appear again, and the world of the creator is clad in blue (“Wie blau ist doch die Welt vom Schöpfer aufgethan!”); and even in “Vision des Erblindeten,” which otherwise contains no natural

---

⁷This letter to Schoenberg, dated 26 May 1914, was quoted previously and more extensively in Chapter 2, p. 58. Quoted in Rode, “Anton Webern und Karl Kraus,” 318. “Ich spüre: das ist alles herrlichste Dichtung, Kunst.”

⁸This letter is dated 23 April 1914. Quoted by Rode, “Anton Webern und Karl Kraus,” 323. A larger excerpt appears in Chapter 2, p. 54. “. . . das ist ein Blick ins Zeitlose, daher auch nach vorne nach dem “Ursprung. (Das ist ein so wunderbar Gedanke von Kraus. Er spricht so oft vom Ursprung)”
imagery, the dying or dead soldier ultimately comprehends that “I am already there, where God’s eye blues” (“Schon bin ich da, wo Gottes Auge blaut”). The adulation of nature, a primary characteristic of the Kraus poems “Wiese im Park,” “Flieder,” and “Vallorbe,” unites these lyrical poems, as does the first-person perspective, which is also shared by “Vision des Erblindeten.” Such natural imagery forms a common characteristic that extends across the wide spectrum of poems that Webern set in his middle period sketches, linking even the most abstruse of Trakl’s verse with the simplest of Rosegger’s arrangements of folk texts.

In contrast, “In tiefster Schuld” and “Mutig trägst du die Last” share neither the natural imagery nor the first-person perspective that links the other Kraus poems that Webern chose. Both of these poems, however, may be interpreted as epitaphs, and it is possible that Webern selected them in honor of his mother. “Mutig,” which Kraus wrote in memory of the late Anne Kalmar, is readily interpreted in this manner. It is interesting to note that Webern was least successful with his attempts to set “In tiefster Schuld” and “Mutig.” Three of the other Kraus settings resulted in at least a continuity draft, and after three preliminary attempts the sketches of “Flieder” culminated in a fairly detailed setting of the entire first stanza. Since Webern’s compositional method during the middle period often revolved around creating musically illustrative settings of natural images, perhaps the lack of such images in the two epitaphs made these settings difficult to accomplish.

The Mutter image, which Webern may have read into “In tiefster Schuld” and “Mutig,” is more explicit in the poem “Vision des Erblindeten,” appearing in both the first and seventh lines of the eight-line poem, perhaps as a hallucination of the wounded and dying soldier. This poem, first published just after World War I, represents a departure from the other Kraus poems that Webern chose to set, as the only poem that has political subject matter. Webern’s musical setting of the poem, with its machine-gun-like chordal repetitions and the fragmented utterances of the wounded solider, also strongly suggests that the composer himself interpreted the poem as an anti-war essay. As such, “Vision des Erblindeten” must be considered alongside those Trakl poems, such as “Klage” and the three-part “Abendland,” that Webern set during the same period and
whose images of destruction and decay also decry the war’s destruction.

Like most Austrians, Webern was an enthusiastic supporter of the German cause at the beginning of World War I, and no doubt Kraus’s outspoken pacifism estranged him from the Schoenberg circle during the early years of the war.\(^9\) By the end of 1916, however, Webern’s enthusiasm for the conflict had waned considerably, as is evident in the following excerpt from a letter that Webern sent to Schoenberg on 7 November 1916:

> When will the war be over? I have completely lost my earlier optimism. At this point, I cannot shake the feeling that it will be a long time before we see freedom. . . . I often come to such fearful doubts about this world. Sometimes it overwhelms me; ah, but I should not think about it any more. . . . it really seems as though Christ had never been. “An eye for an eye, tooth for a tooth,” the old law from the Old Testament alone has authority.”\(^10\)

Interestingly, although Webern had originally commented on the artistry of Kraus’s poetry in a letter to Schoenberg in May 1914, just before the war broke out that summer, it was not until in the autumn of 1916 that Webern began setting Kraus’s poetry. Perhaps the timing was merely coincidental, for “Wiese im Park” did not appear in *Die Fackel* until December 1915, and Webern was quite busy as a soldier during most of the

\(^9\)Although Webern is often regarded as naive for his outspoken pro-German sentiments during both world wars, many of Webern’s idols were pro-war in the summer of 1914, not the least of whom was Schoenberg himself. See Stuckenschmidt, *Arnold Schoenberg*, 191. Among Webern’s literary idols who put pen to paper in nationalistic defense of the war effort were both Richard Dehmel and Rainer Maria Rilke. For a discussion of Kraus’s response to the pro-war nationalism of German and Austrian intellectuals, see Timms, *Apocalyptic Satirist*, 287-303.

following year, but perhaps his interest in Kraus was rekindled once the unforeseen deprivations of war had embittered the composer’s opinion of the conflict. When censorship was lifted and “Vision des Erblindeten” appeared in 1918, Webern must have found the lyrical anti-war expression of this poem attractive, couched as it is in rather indirect terms and in close association with both the “Mutter” concept and the “blau” of the Ursprung.”

Webern undoubtedly also admired the formal simplicity of Kraus’s verse, a literary characteristic that is closely related to the author’s insistence on clear and comprehensible language. It is in his attitude towards the correct use of language that Kraus is at his most conservative, leading him unabashedly to imitate Goethe’s verse. Erich Heller has described how the conservatism of Kraus’s lyrical verse is related to the poet’s ideal of the Ursprung:

A first and superficial judgement may class this poetry as “Epigonendichtung”; and this is what, in a particular sense [Kraus] called it himself. Its forms, meters, rhythms and rhymes are traditional. It is determined by the history of German poetry from Goethe to Liliencron. . . . Kraus’s poetry . . . is the poetry of speech. He never allows his genius to busy himself in regions beyond the beginning that began with the word. But there he is at home and at his Ursprung.  

Although the conventional meters and rhyme schemes of Kraus’s poetry may seem at odds with the most complicated of Trakl’s verse set during the same period, many of the poems that Webern chose during his middle period are equally if not more conservative in some respects. For instance, in 1916, when he first created the fragmentary settings of “Wiese im Park,” Webern also set Rosegger’s arrangement of the simplistic folk poem “Der Tag ist vergangen” (op. 12 no. 1), as well as Trakl’s “In den Nachmittag geflüstert” (M. 215), the latter of which conveys a series of contrasting, disjunct images.

---

11 Webern’s library catalog also lists Kraus’s monumental anti-war drama Der letzten Tage der Menschheit (Vienna, 1919). Widely considered Kraus’s masterpiece, this sardonic drama could not be published until after the war.

12 Erich Heller, Disinherited Mind, 252-53.

13 “Der Tag ist vergangen” is comprised of two quatrains, has an ABCA rhyme scheme, and the first line of each stanza repeats the title phrase.
within a conservative ABBA rhyme scheme.\textsuperscript{14} During the next year, when the first fair copy (ultimately a revision draft) of “Wiese im Park” was created, Webern also worked with such diverse poems as Trakl’s “Verklärung” (M. 225), with its free form, fractured syntax and juxtaposition of unrelated, macabre images,\textsuperscript{15} as well as the Goethe poems “Gleich und Gleich” (op. 12 no. 4) and “Gegenwart” (M. 220). Even as Webern turned toward the avant garde verse of Trakl’s \textit{Sebastian im Traum} (1915), he also set anonymous folk texts such as “Das Kreuz, das musst’ er tragen” (op. 15 no. 1, set in 1921). Amid these diverse poetic forms the works of Kraus, along with the texts of Goethe and perhaps Bethge, inhabit a middle ground on a continuum of poetic expression. After 1921 Webern never set another Trakl text, and he became far more conservative in his selection of poems for musical settings. Except for the last Kraus poem, “Mutig trägst du die Last,” M. 211, which he set in 1924, during 1922-1925 he concentrated exclusively on folk texts, such as “Morgenlied” from \textit{Des Knaben Wunderhorn}, and anonymous liturgical texts, such as those that comprise the \textit{Five Canons on Latin Texts}, op. 16. Webern’s preference for conventional texts continued and became even more narrowly focused after the advent of the twelve-tone method, and between 1926 and 1930 he set only texts by Goethe, two of which were published as op.

\textsuperscript{14}The two Trakl poems that Webern set in 1916, “In der Heimat” (M. 214) and “In den Nachmittag geflüstert” (M. 215), are from the poet’s first published collection, \textit{Gedichte} (1913), and feature strict meters and rhyme-schemes. The other fourteen poems that Webern set appeared either in \textit{Sebastian im Traum} (1915) or in the journal \textit{Der Brenner}. Many of the later group display the free verse and discontinuous images of the poet’s mature style. See Shreffler’s \textit{Lyric Impulse}, particularly pp. 27-38, for a thorough discussion of the Trakl poems that Webern set to music.

Shreffler, \textit{Lyric Impulse}, 29, wrote the following concerning M. 215: “The fact that one poem encompasses so many diverse images within a strict verse-structure may have caused Webern problems not presented by the relatively simpler texts he had used in this vocal miniatures of 1913-14 . . . which may be why Webern’s first efforts were not successful.”

\textsuperscript{15}Webern ultimately created six musically distinct and fragmentary settings of “Verklärung,” but none was ever completed. Shreffler reproduces this entire poem on pp. 29-30 and discusses it on pp. 133-44 of \textit{Lyric Impulse}. 
19. Even though Kraus could be viewed, and certainly viewed himself, as a contemporary complement to Goethe, Webern never set another Kraus text after 1924.

It is paradoxical that Webern stopped setting Kraus’s poetry at the same time that he began to focus narrowly on the most conventional of poetic expressions. Both Susanne Rode and Lauriejean Reinhardt have argued that Webern moved toward these conventional texts, and eventually exclusively to the verse of Jone, because of the composer’s aesthetic belief in the essential comprehensibility (Faßlichkeit) of his twelve-tone music, an aesthetic that was inextricably bound with Kraus’s view of language:

The poems Webern did set during these years suggest an increased interest in texts that, like his twelve-tone works, affirmed the expediency and cohesive unity of language . . . . what was required was the return to a type of purified language or Ursprache that had been cleansed of all linguistic impurities and distortions and in which words served effectively and responsibly as agents of meaning. . . . That Webern would turn to poetry written in such a conventional idiom . . . should not be surprising given the Krausian foundation of the twelve-tone aesthetics. 16

The fact that Webern framed his Weg and Formenlehre lectures of the early 1930s with multiple references to Kraus indicates that the composer appreciated the link between their aesthetic positions. As discussed previously in Chapter 2, as Webern moved toward the largely positive and Christian-centered view of Ludwig von Ficker and Der Brenner, he, like many other pre-War Kraus enthusiasts, came to re-evaluate the satirist, his fundamental pessimism and the concomitant focus on apocalypse and cultural decay. Webern continued to admire Kraus as a great man, however, and continued to read his works throughout his life.

It seems certain that Webern was drawn to the humanity of Kraus’s lyrical voice, a voice of romantic sentimentality that was in striking contrast to his literary persona of an isolated and misanthropic satirist. Much of Kraus’s lyric poetry was indeed related to the most personal aspects of his life, a private life that he jealously guarded from the public eye. One of the earliest of Kraus’s poems to appear in Die Fackel, “An eine Heilige” (Webern’s fragmentary settings of which are referenced throughout this study as “Mutig

trägst du die Last,” M. 211), was written in memory of Annie Kalmar, an actress whom Kraus admired and who had died in 1901 at the age of 23. Likewise, many of the lyric poems that Kraus penned were directly related to his long-term love affair with Sidonie Nadherny, and the first Kraus poem that Webern selected for a musical setting, “Wiese im Park,” was specifically related to Sidonie by its subtitle, “Schloß Janowitz.” Although there is no evidence that Webern and Kraus were on intimate terms, and indeed it seems unlikely, it is possible that Webern would have had some knowledge of Kraus’s personal life through his own close association with mutual friends such as Adolf Loos. Even if he did not, the Kraus poems that Webern chose demonstrate that the composer was drawn to the compassion of Kraus’s lyrical voice. Through this voice the facade of Kraus’s satirical mask could be pierced and the tender heart of a man might be glimpsed, as was explained by Erich Heller, who clearly admired Kraus’s poetry:

If there could be any doubt left about the authenticity of [Kraus’s] satire, it would be removed by his lyrical utterances. They set in relief the works of hate against a background of light. As the scope of his satirical work widened and the darkness of its world deepened, so his poetic genius gained in simplicity and spontaneity, his lyrical work in tenderness and affection. It shows his satire to be merely the imploring gesture of a lover who seeks to guard what he loves against the evil of the world closing in upon it.  

Webern’s reception of Kraus, from his earliest comments on Kraus’s satire to his references to Kraus in the *Path to the New Music* lectures of the early 1930s, was always tempered by a critical distance. None of Webern’s correspondence, nor anything in the memoirs of his contemporaries, demonstrates the composer to have been at all sympathetic to the most cynical of Kraus’s satiric modes of expression, especially when the subject of the satire hit close to home—Viennese cultural life, Schoenberg, or music. Whether this disdain for Kraus’s satirical voice arose from a lack of understanding or was simply a matter of taste is difficult, if not impossible, to determine, given Webern’s sparse written comments. Rode described the history of Webern’s Kraus reception as

---

“unusual” (ungewöhnlich), postulating that Webern’s judgments of Kraus ranged from adulation to disdain. Reinhardt, on the other hand, wrote, “It would be perhaps more accurate to say that, like Jone, Webern passed from an initial stage of idol worship to a period in which Kraus’s ideas were more carefully scrutinized, to a final stage of self-realization when certain of Kraus’s views were assimilated into a more highly personal worldview.” Reinhardt’s last stage of Webern’s Kraus reception is clearly evident in the critical distance of his references to Kraus in the *Path to the New Music* lectures, during which he repeatedly cited Kraus to verify his own theories of artistic integrity and then berated the satirist for lacking the facility to understand the clear analogue (in Webern’s mind) between linguistic and musical ideas. There is scant evidence of any initial stage of idol worship, however. In a few letters from 1910 Webern did list Kraus’s name along with Mahler, Weininger, Schoenberg and other men he admired (see Chapter 2, p. 50), yet a letter from Berg to his wife (see p. 51 n. 82) indicates that Webern harshly criticized Kraus at least as early as 1909, even before the first mention of Kraus’s own writings occurs in Webern’s correspondence in April 1910. Although Webern was certainly subject to fits of unbridled enthusiasm and vehemence, his response to Kraus—like that of many others—was always multifaceted, and the composer held these various responses in tension. For Webern, who admired Kraus as a great man and literary icon, the compassion of Kraus’s lyric voice may have been like a rare glimpse of light, evidence of a humanity with which he could feel deep sympathy.

---


20 It is important to recall that *Die Fackel* featured many writers for the first eleven years of its publication and only stopped taking submissions in December 1911, so the fact that Webern had been a regular reader of the journal since as early as 1905 does not necessarily reflect an enthusiasm for Kraus alone.
Webern’s Compositional Development as Evidenced in the Kraus Settings

Moving Away from the Aphoristic Style

Webern scholarship accepts largely as a truism that the composer embarked on a decade of song composition, beginning in 1914, with the partial goal of moving away from the aphoristic mode of expression that was epitomized by the works Six Bagatelles, op. 9, Five Pieces for Orchestra, op. 10, and Three Little Pieces, op. 11. The Second Viennese School composers expressed this view themselves, when Schoenberg and Webern addressed the issue in their lectures of the early 1930s, each describing their musical aphorism as symptomatic of a crisis that had begun with the abandonment of tonality and the resulting absence of harmonic function as a foundation for musical form. The composers were in consensus—no doubt after years of retrospective conversation—that they had used text setting as a strategy to move away from an increasingly concise mode of expression. Their comments must be evaluated, of course, from their aesthetic viewpoint of the 1930s, one that held their own musical development and indeed the entire history of music as teleologically oriented towards twelve-tone composition. Certainly part of their mutual program during the lectures of the 1930s was the explication of twelve-tone procedures as a foundation par excellence for coherent musical forms. Webern’s comments from just before the beginning of the “vocal decade,” however, also lend credence to their much later claim. In a letter to Schoenberg from 26 May 1914 Webern described his intention to compose an extended piece for cello and piano as an “occasion to find at last an approach to longer movements again—your idea.” This piece was ultimately abandoned. Then in July 1914, upon the occasion of sending Schoenberg a copy of his newly completed Three Little Pieces, op.

---

21Schoenberg makes this comment in “Composition with Twelve Tones (1),” in Style and Idea: Selected Writings of Arnold Schoenberg, 217-18. The original lecture was written in 1934 and first published in the first edition of Style and Idea, 1950. Webern addressed this same issue in The Path to New Music, 53-54.

22Moldenhauer, Chronicle, 205.
11, Webern’s letter was practically apologetic: “I am sending you by the same mail a copy of what I last wrote . . . . I beg you not to be indignant that it has again become something so short. I should like to tell you how this happened and thereby try to justify myself.”

Webern’s comment reveals that in 1914 both he and Schoenberg saw the extreme concision of Webern’s works as problematic, and that for Webern this outcome seemed unavoidable. Ultimately, however, he did manage to turn away from the aphoristic style, as Moldenhauer explained:

Then, in the same spring of 1914, he entered upon a long period of vocal writing, which was to continue through the Two Songs, op. 19 (1926), to be interrupted only by a few instrumental essays that were never completed. A poem obviously does not allow a musical setting to be terser than the span of its text. Therefore, by turning once again to the Lied at this juncture, Webern imposed upon himself a form of discipline that would help him break with his ever more compressed mode of expression and arrive at more extended musical structures.”

One way that Webern sought to create extended pieces was by simply selecting poems that were longer and more complicated than those that he had chosen previously. This strategy proved to be immediately, if only partially, successful, and some of the resulting sketch fragments from early 1915, such as those for Trakl’s sonnet “In der Heimat,” M.214, and Bethge’s “In der Fremde” (op. 13 no. 3 in a later orchestral song version), are longer than any of the completed songs from that year.

Subsequently, after nearly two years of little compositional activity, due largely to his military service, at the end of 1916 Webern sketched two different settings of Kraus’s “Wiese im Park.” Once again, the fact that Webern chose such a lengthy poem—comprising three quatrains grouped in lines of 10 10 10 and 6 syllables, respectively—is itself a testament to the

---

21 Letter to Schoenberg, July 1914. Quoted in Moldenhauer, Chronicle, 205.

24 Moldenhauer, Chronicle, 263.

25 The 1915 piano and voice setting of “In der Heimat” sets half of the poem (seven of fourteen lines) to 59 beats of music. Therefore, assuming a continuation in the same scale, a complete setting could have comprised 118 beats. The piano and voice version of “In der Fremde” from the same year sets five of the poem’s seven lines to 58 beats, and therefore could have comprised approximately 81 beats if completed. See Shreffler, Lyric Impulse, 88-90.
composer’s desire to create a more expansive musical expression. One fragmentary sketch for soprano and chamber ensemble, PSS manuscript 101-0502, did not proceed very far, but the four-page sketch fragment for voice and piano sets two-thirds of the poem, comprising 33 measures or approximately 99 beats as compared to the 102 beats of the published version. Shreffler has calculated that, assuming Webern had continued the abandoned Lied in the same manner and on the same relative scale, the piece could have been more than thirty percent longer (149 beats) than the “Wiese im Park” continuity draft that he created in 1917, which is itself one of Webern’s longest works.\(^{26}\) During the summer of 1918 the composer selected another, slightly longer Kraus poem, “Vallorbe,” M. 232, which consists of a dozen twelve-syallable lines. The earliest sketch fragment on this poem (101-0582) is seven measures long and sets only half of the first line, but if the composer had set all three quatrains on the same scale, the piece could have also been well over 140 beats long. This calculation is supported by the length of the “Vallorbe” continuity draft that Webern also created that summer. This 60-measure orchestral song, which of course sets the entire text, comprises 139 beats, making it significantly longer than the published version of “Wiese im Park.” Among Webern’s subsequent Kraus sketches only those of “Flieder,” M. 246, another poem of three quatrains, approaches the length of the “Wiese im Park” and “Vallorbe” sketches.\(^{27}\) The four fragmentary settings of “Flieder,” each of which was created in 1920 and sets only the first quatrains, have potential finished lengths ranging between approximately 72 and 100 beats.\(^{28}\)

\(^{26}\)The fragmentary piano and voice setting of Goethe’s “Gegenwart, which Webern also created in 1917, comprises 38 beats and could have been 98 beats long if completed. *Lyric Impulse*, 89.

\(^{27}\)The continuity draft of “Vision des Erblindeten,” M. 236, an eight-line poem, is 34 measures long and comprises 70 beats, making the song comparable to the overall scale of “Wiese im Park” and “Vallorbe” when the relative lengths of the texts are taken into account.

\(^{28}\)Including the instrumental introductions, which range from two to three beats in length, the numbers of beats in three of the “Flieder” sketches are as follows: 103-0788 contains 24 beats; 103-0793 contains 25 beats; 103-0790 contains 27 beats. Not including the twelve-beat instrumental introduction, “Flieder” sketch 103-0791 sets the
Webern’s resolve to create longer pieces may explain why he described his more successful compositions from the summer of 1917, including the relatively long continuity draft of “Wiese im Park,” in the following manner: “Now I am writing completely differently. . . . Homogeneous sounds, in part long themes, altogether something entirely different from before the war.” This often-quoted comment reveals that Webern attributed part of his success in creating longer forms to his increasing ability to generate more expansive thematic material. Even more than their general length, it is from the standpoint of melodic development that Webern’s post-1914 songs stand in stark contrast to the earlier, aphoristic style. As opposed to the fractured, two-, three- or four-note melodic motives of opera 9-11, the fragments and completed songs of Webern’s vocal decade exhibit a style that Shreffler has described as “an atonal style based on longer lines and contrapuntal textures [that draws] upon an ever-increasing mastery of motivic connections.” As has been pointed out in the earlier discussion of “Wiese im Park,” op. 13 no. 1, this score features densely polyphonic passages involving three, four, or more relatively expansive melodic figures. These melodies and countermelodies are complexly interrelated by cellular motives that accrue throughout the course of the work, giving the overall texture the homogeneous quality on which Webern commented.

Among the Kraus sketches, “Wiese im Park” exhibits the trait of increased polyphonic density more strongly than any other. Neither of the other continuity drafts, “Vision des Erblindeten” and “Vallorbe,” features any passage to compare with the linear interest of “Wiese im Park” mm. 21-37, and these unpublished continuity drafts are often marked by very sparse textures, particularly in the case of “Vallorbe.” Whereas “Vision des

---


30 “Mein Weg geht jetzt vorüber,” 278.
Erblindeten” is much more thickly scored than “Vallorbe,” the densest passages are those that involve the homorhythmic “machine-gun” chords and the similar, motivically related figures. Next to “Wiese im Park,” the most detailed of the fragmentary sketches on “Flieder” (103-0790) is the most densely polyphonic Kraus setting, and the 103-0760 version of “In tiefster Schuld” shows some polyphonic promise, although neither of these sketches proceeded far enough to allow comment on the development of these themes.

Aggregate Phrasing

One of the compositional strategies encountered most consistently in Webern’s Kraus sketches is the use of complete chromatic sets, or aggregates, to delineate small-scale formal divisions within the music, creating what I have termed “aggregate phrases.” Aggregate phrasing appears throughout the Kraus sketches, uniting the earliest sketches of “Wiese im Park” in 1916 with the 1924 sketches of “Mutig trägst du die Last,” M. 211, the last Kraus poem that Webern set. Many of Webern’s early atonal compositions, both vocal and instrumental, exhibit some form of aggregate use, as the composer himself recalled during his Path to the New Music lectures of the early 1930s. While speaking particularly of the Six Bagatelles, op. 9 (1911-1913) Webern made the following, often-quoted observations:

Here I had the feeling that when the twelve notes had all been played the piece was over. Much later I realized that all this was part of a necessary development. In my sketchbook I wrote out the chromatic scale and crossed off individual notes. Why? Because I had convinced myself, “This note had been there already.” It sounds grotesque, incomprehensible, and it was incredibly difficult. . . . In short, a law came into being. Until all twelve notes have appeared none of them may occur again. The most important thing is that each successive “run” of the twelve notes marked a division within the piece, idea, or theme.  

keiner von ihnen wiederkommen. Das Wichtigste ist, daß das Stück, der Gedanke, das Thema, durch die einmalige Abwicklung der zwölf Töne einen Einschnitt bekommen hat.”

Shreffler has pointed out there are in fact surprisingly few extant manuscripts in Webern’s Nachlaß that contain chromatic scales with crossed off notes such as the composer described. (There certainly are a lot of them among my analytical notes for this dissertation, however!) She goes on to describe the only such manuscript known, a fragmentary setting of Stefan George’s “Kunfttag III” from 1914. See “Mein Weg geht jetzt vorüber,” 282-83. A facsimile of this sketch page is provided on p. 283 of Shreffler’s article.

In this retrospective, and in many ways revisionist, view of his own compositional development, Webern associated his early use of aggregates with the eventual creation of “a law” that governed the repetition of pitch classes. The refinement of aggregate technique to include the element of ordering actually took well over a decade and, as Shreffler has demonstrated, constituted a conceptual leap that was not easily made by the composer, even after he created his earliest twelve-tone sketches.32 Several of Webern’s Kraus settings, along with the numerous other complete and fragmentary songs that he created between 1914 and 1924, reveal that the composer experimented with various methods of composing with the total chromatic set.

Shreffler has suggested that Webern’s self-conscious effort to include all twelve tones in the fragmentary “Kunfttag III” sketch of 1914 could have been motivated by conversations with Schoenberg. Schoenberg is known to have created a twelve-tone melody for a scherzo in May 1914,33 and according to Ethan Haimo, he continued to experiment with controlling the entire chromatic set between 1914 and 1918.34

32Shreffler, “Mein Weg geht jetzt vorüber,” 288. Describing Webern’s earliest attempts at composition with a twelve-tone row, Shreffler wrote, “The attempt foundered on his inability to reconcile an inflexibly ordered series with the freely developing vocal line that normally served as Hauptsstimme.”

33Stuckenschmidt, Arnold Schoenberg, 190. This scherzo manuscript is dated 27 May 1914.

34Ethan Haimo, Schoenberg’s Serial Odyssey: The Evolution of His Twelve-Tone Method (Oxford: Oxford University Press), 42.
Schoenberg later claimed to have discussed his twelve-tone scherzo theme with Webern. This development would undoubtedly have been of great interest to the younger composer, and it is likely that he and Schoenberg had discussed such strategies well before 1914. Several of Webern’s earlier compositions demonstrate that he had also been experimenting with methods of controlling the chromatic set. Matthew Shaftel has described intriguing examples of “aggregate structured phrasing” in the songs “Himmelfahrt,” M. 131, and “Helle Nacht,” M. 132, both composed in 1908 and published posthumously among the Five Songs after Poems by Richard Dehmel. Both Henri Pousseur and Paul Kabbash have described similar compositional strategies in Webern’s Six Bagatelles, op. 9, composed in 1911 and 1913, and Elizabeth Marvin has described three different methods through which Webern used complete aggregates in the composition of the posthumously published orchestral pieces of 1913. Two of these three methods result in aggregate phrases, and one of these explores combinatorial relationships within the aggregate phrase.

In relation to the Kraus sketches, what is most interesting in Webern’s comment regarding the “run of the twelve notes” is the association of these aggregates with formal musical subdivisions (“division, idea, or theme”). In nearly all of the Kraus sketches that exhibit coherent aggregates, as well as in works described by other scholars, pitch classes

---

35 Schoenberg, “Composition with Twelve-Tones [2],” in Style and Idea, 247. “I had sketched many themes, among them one for a scherzo which consisted of all the twelve tones. An historian will probably some day find in the exchange of letters between Webern and me how enthusiastic we were about this.”


are freely repeated within the aggregate, yet one or more pitch classes are withheld until the end of the phrase, thereby marking a formal subdivision within the piece. In the case of the Kraus songs, the completion or resolution of the aggregate phrase often coincides with the end of an instrumental introduction or interlude and with the beginning or end of a phrase of vocal text. Discussions of this practice in Webern’s atonal songs are rare, although Shreffler provides a few examples of aggregate phrases in her description of Webern’s Trakl settings. In her discussion of ostinato technique in “Verklärung,” M. 225, fragment no. 2 (1917), for instance, she wrote, “At the same time, Webern keeps all twelve pitches (unordered) in circulation. He sets up a chromatic field with one note missing; the absent note is then provided in a strategic place and functions like a resolution.” As a general description, this sounds very much like the technique that I have described, but in the example she provided the resolution of the “chromatic field” (aggregate) is not clearly associated with a musical phrase—certainly not as clearly as what is multiply represented in the Kraus sketches. On the other hand, Shreffler also described a fragmentary setting of “Die Sonne” (op. 14 no. 1 in a later version), sketched in 1918, that does present an aggregate phrase. In this sketch the first two notes of the vocal entrance complete an aggregate, the first ten pitch classes of which were presented within the instrumental introduction. As has been described in detail in the previous chapters—and will be summarized below—elision is one of the techniques by which aggregates are resolved in the Kraus sketches, as well. Among Webern’s later songs, Donna Lynn Levern’s description of op. 17 no. 1 as comprising “abutting, unordered twelve-note groups” also comes close to describing the technique seen in the Kraus sketches, but here the application of the technique has an important difference. Levern was describing a later refinement of aggregate phrasing that is close to twelve-tone

Lyric Impulse, 120.

Ibid., 227.

“Genesis, Process, and Reception of Anton Webern’s Twelve-Tone Music,” 73, 79-83.
technique, a method in which no pitch classes are repeated until the entire aggregate has sounded. The only Kraus sketch that matches Levern’s general description is the 103-0807 version of “Mutig,” M. 211, which was composed in 1924, the same year that op. 17 no. 1 was created, but this sketch contains no definitive evidence of ordering.

Webern’s Kraus settings demonstrate that the composer experimented for many years with a wide variety of more or less sophisticated ways of manipulating chromatic aggregates. As is almost invariably the case in Webern’s song sketches, all of the Kraus settings begin with instrumental introductions, and it is in these introductions that the aggregate-oriented compositional technique appears most often. In fact, many of these sketches present a clear aggregate phrase in the introduction and nowhere else. In these introductions the first aggregate is often completed by the instruments either just before or simultaneously with the first vocal entrance, thereby differentiating the first instrumental phrase from the vocal setting that follows. Clear, though subtly different, examples of this type of aggregate construction are provided by the two “Wiese in Park” sketch fragments of 1916. In the earliest of these two fragmentary sketches (101-0502) the instrumental introduction provides every pitch class within the first three beats (see Example 5.1). Three pcs (E, F and B=) appear twice, although never in the same octave, among the fifteen pitches of the introduction, but pcs C, D and E= are heard only once, when they resolve the first aggregate on the downbeat of m. 2. After the resolution of the aggregate, rests were notated in every instrumental staff, clearly delineating the first phrase and the end of the introduction. Rests frequently appear after the ends of aggregates in these manuscripts, so the placement of rests often provides a clue to the underlying chromatic structure. In the particular instance of “Wiese im Park” sketch 101-0502 the first vocal entrance also occurs on the downbeat of m. 2, but the g¹ that initiates the vocal melody represents a pitch class that has already appeared, so the vocal line does not participate in the conclusion of the first aggregate phrase. The second phrase of 101-0502, mm. 2-3, presents a second aggregate, which is again resolved in the instruments, this time on the last beat of m. 3, just after the vocal melody completes the first line of text. As in the first aggregate, as well as in nearly every similar use of aggregates among
the Kraus sketches, pitch classes are freely repeated within the aggregate, although one is withheld until a structurally significant point. Interestingly, in 101-0502 the final pitch of the second aggregate is pc D once again, this time appearing as d in the bass clarinet as the lowest pitch of the final tetrachord. This brief sketch almost completely breaks down at this point, and the only thing clearly notated in m. 4 are quarter rests in every instrumental staff, which once again delineate the aggregate phrase.

The first page of the second fragmentary “Wiese im Park” sketch (piano/voice version, 101-0503) provides a subtly different application of the same technique. In this sketch the aggregate in the instrumental introduction is completed by the first pitch of the vocal entrance (b¹). The first instrumental phrase therefore elides with the first vocal phrase. Another very similar example is provided by the earliest fragmentary sketch of “Vallorbe” (101-0582). In that sketch the aggregate of the instrumental introduction is completed when the voice enters on c<¹ at the end of m. 2. After the introductory two measures of this “Vallorbe” fragment subsequent aggregate formations delineate later sectional divisions, although somewhat less clearly.

In a very few sketch fragments the first aggregate is completed neither before the vocal entrance nor by the first pitch of the vocal line, but rather the instrumental introduction and the setting of the first vocal line are united into one aggregate and musical phrase. Fragmentary “Flieder” sketch 103-0793 provides a case in point. In this sketch the combined instrumental parts of m. 1 create a 10-pitch chromatic field that repeats pc G but omits pcs C, C< and D. The vocalist provides the pc C when she enters on c² at the end of m. 1, and the sketch’s first aggregate is complete when the clarinet’s three-note solo resolves from d² to c<¹ in m. 2 in nearly parallel motion with the end of the first vocal phrase. The overlapping entrances of other instrumental figures on beat 2 of m. 2 obscures the aggregate formations and concomitant phrase structures, but again

---

⁴²See Example 5.3 for a transcription.

⁴³See Example 4.2 for a transcription.

⁴⁴See Example 4.26 for a transcription.
the placement of rests, as well as the spatial layout of the different voices on the sketch page, demonstrate the composer’s intent.

Aggregate phrases appear again and again within the earliest measures of Webern’s Kraus sketches, and, as was already mentioned, it is not unusual for these opening aggregate phrases to be the only clear examples within the sketch—indeed, this is the most common scenario. As was demonstrated in the earliest of the two “Wiese im Park” sketch fragments (101-0502), however, in some sketches subsequent phrases will also be outlined by aggregates. In a few manuscripts aggregate-oriented phrase structures will be widely separately within the piece by phrase after phrase of musical materials that do not seem to be founded on aggregates. Where these isolated aggregate phrases do occur, they are most often associated with the instrumental interludes that separate stanzas within a song. The continuity draft of “Vision des Erblindeten” (1919) provides an excellent example.45 In this draft the opening instrumental figures hint at an underlying aggregate formation, but the evidence is not nearly as clear and convincing as that found in many other sketches—possibly due to revisions of the musical material, although this cannot be verified. Later aggregate formations are much clearer, however. For instance, the heavily revised instrumental interlude on beats 2 and 3 of m. 11, which separates the setting of the second and third poetic lines, provides a complete aggregate that resolves on g♭1, the only pitch on the downbeat of m. 12. A very similar pattern develops during the instrumental interlude in mm. 18-19. There, the f♯ played by the harp on the otherwise silent downbeat of m. 20 completes the aggregate. Another convincing and isolated aggregate phrase occurs in m. 29, where another instrumental interlude, presented entirely by the viola figure, provides most of another aggregate, omitting only the pc E that is provided as the lowest pitch of the harp tetrachord on the downbeat of m. 30. While aggregate phrases certainly appear in texted parts of the songs as well, it is interesting to note that they occur most often in purely instrumental sections, as if the instrumental sections are somehow more in need of an underpinning or substructure that

45See Example 4.16 for a transcription.
is perhaps supplied everywhere else by the text itself.

The most extensive use of the aggregate-oriented compositional strategy is presented by the continuity draft of “Vallorbe,” M. 232, composed in 1918. Although subsequent revisions have obscured the earliest layers of the compositional process in many measures, this draft appears to have been completely conceived as a series of aggregate phrases, each of which clearly delineates a poetic phrase or instrumental interlude. These aggregate phrases reveal the wide spectrum of possibilities that Webern explored for presenting and resolving aggregates. Many of the aggregate phrases are self-contained and clearly delineated, while others elide or overlap at the ends and beginnings of phrases. Although these aggregates are unordered, and pitch classes are freely repeated, the composer may have used the aggregate formations to create a chromatic harmonic background in which there was an approximate equality among the pitches. This chromatic equilibrium was not an end in itself, however, for the composer then revised the material to create motivic connections, subjugating the original approach in favor of other musical considerations. Among Webern’s continuity drafts and larger sketch fragments, the “Vallorbe” draft presents the only example of such an all-encompassing use of aggregate phrasing (at least among the Kraus sketches) although some of the shorter fragments, such as the 101-0502 “Wiese im Park” fragment mentioned previously, have similar potential.

One of the two fragmentary sketches of “In tiefster Schuld,” M. 210, PSS manuscript 103-0760, provides examples of two different approaches to creating aggregate phrases, one that is common among Webern’s Kraus manuscripts and another that constitutes a unique and very interesting refinement of the technique. Like many other sketches in this study, the instrumental introduction provides a complete aggregate that is resolved within the instrumental ensemble, in this case when the clarinet plays a\(^1\) on the downbeat of m. 2.\(^{46}\) The initial entrance of the voice at the end of m. 1 overlaps the clarinet dyad that closed the first aggregate phrase, but the vocal line does not

\(^{46}\)See Example 4.25 for a transcription.
participate in that resolution. The second phrase of this sketch also employs an aggregate-oriented strategy, but in this case two aggregates unfold simultaneously. Furthermore, these concurrent aggregates are segregated into two 8-8 pc sets and their complements, primarily presented by the voice and violin as linear themes. Through subsequent revisions the clarity of the instrumental aggregate and its complementary subsets becomes less clear, but because of its preliminary nature the manuscript maintains successive stages of the compositional process. Though the vocal line maintained its integrity, the violin’s linear 8-8 set was simplified and some of its pitch classes moved to other instrumental voices. Near the end of this sketch a tell-tale extra-musical marking, a slanted line that connects the vocal line to the harmonium bass line, signals that Webern continued using one of these 8-8 sets without transposition as a linear element in the next musical phrase and that this linear set was to cross from the vocal line into the harmonium’s bass clef. As in so many other sketches, if the sketch had continued to a more advanced stage, with the seemingly inevitable erasure of earlier layers, much of the information that strengthens this analysis would have been lost. As an abandoned sketch, this fragment reveals Webern creating a complex polyphonic texture by juxtaposing simultaneous aggregates. These aggregates are internally organized and externally interrelated through complementary set relationships, and they resolve simultaneously to delineate an aggregate phrase.

Webern’s experiments with aggregate phrasing span the entire period during which he set Kraus’s poems, and the last examples of this technique among these manuscripts appear in the three fragmentary settings of “Mutig trägst du die Last,” M. 211, the last of his Kraus settings. These sketches were created sometime before 10 December 1924 but probably well after the composer’s earliest experiments with twelve-tone technique in 1922.\(^47\) Like every other work and fragment that falls between the

\(^{47}\)Webern’s first twelve-tone sketches are found in a fragmentary sketch of “Mein Weg geht jetzt vorüber,” created in the summer of 1922. The twelve-tone version of this setting was abandoned, and the setting was completed in a free atonal style and eventually published as op. 5 no. 4. See Shreffler, “Mein Weg geht jetzt vorüber,” 278. Shreffler has suggested that Webern and Schoenberg might have discussed the twelve-tone method
As early as August 1921, well before the formal announcement in February of 1923; see ibid., 286-87. Webern was in fact not very productive between 1922 and 1924. The only compositions that he completed during this time are the non-dodecaphonic Five Canons, op. 16.

As was observed in Chapter 4, the “Mutig” sketches—particularly 103-0807—share characteristics with the “Mein Weg geht jetzt vorüber” fragment, yet the “Mutig” sketches are best understood as further experiments with and refinements of the aggregate phrase technique that Webern had honed throughout the middle period songs. All versions of this work exhibit aggregate phrases, but the 103-0807 voice and piano version of the setting presents a refinement of this technique that is of particular interest. This six-measure fragment, which provides a vocal line adequate to set only the fourteen syllables of poetic line 1, comprises two adjacent aggregate phrases, one that is presented by the seven-beat piano introduction and a second that sets the first six syllables of the text. The sketch was abandoned after Webern made multiple attempts to fashion the piano accompaniment of the second aggregate phrase, and it ends with an unaccompanied vocal setting of the remainder of line 1. The 103-0807 fragment is characterized by an extremely sparse texture and the contrapuntal unfolding of unordered, fixed-pitch class sets in both the voice and piano. The multiple layers of revision still legible in the manuscript demonstrate that the composer was experimenting with segregating the chromatic set into combinatorial subsets. During the second aggregate phrase (the first vocal phrase) the vocal line presents a 6-7 pc set (B=C E F< in normal order) while

as early as August 1921, well before the formal announcement in February of 1923; see ibid., 286-87.

48Webern was in fact not very productive between 1922 and 1924. The only compositions that he completed during this time are the non-dodecaphonic Five Canons, op. 16.

49As discussed in Chapter 4, there are actually four versions of “Mutig,” if the three-measure, textless instrumental introduction at the top of the earliest sketch page (cataloged as the “nouveau” sketch) is an abandoned version of “Mutig,” as I believe.

50See Examples 4.42 and 4.43 for a transcription and analysis.
the piano presents the complementary set, which, due to its inherent symmetry, is also a 6-7 pc set (C<D E=G A=A in normal order). In each revision of the piano accompaniment the composer rhythmically displaced the attacks of the vocal and piano parts so that the entrance of every or nearly every pitch class is heard in isolation. The vocal line of the second vocal phrase then begins with five of the pitch classes found in the 6-7 pc set of the piano part in the previous phrase. This musically-ordered description probably does not reflect the actual order of the compositional process, however. The vocal line, which was probably notated first in its entirety, sets the first fourteen-syllable poetic line to an aggregate that is complete on the penultimate pitch (pc G) and repeats only pcs B= and B. The two repeated pitches are the antepenultimate and final pitches of both vocal phrases (b-f<−b=a in m. 3 and b=a−g=b in mm. 5-6), creating a similar linear cadential pattern. All three “Mutig” sketch fragments exhibit a similar technique of grouping specific pitch classes into linear sets of five or six pitches, and some of these fixed-pc tetrachords and pentachords are shared by two and in some cases all three versions. There is no indication of ordering, however, suggesting that Webern was working with pitch class sets that he freely manipulated and rearranged. Although brief and ultimately unsuccessful, the 103-0708 “Mutig” sketch fragment represents an endpoint in Webern’s experimentation with aggregate phrasing that was only one conceptual step away from the composer’s twelve-tone method.

Use of Octatonic Sonorities

As has already been mentioned in the introductory chapter and at other points within this study, some recent analyses of Webern’s atonal works, most notably those of Allen Forte, have postulated that the composer drew on the pitch resources of the octatonic scale. This approach has been largely supported by recent scholarship, which has shown that Webern’s atonal works often make use of octatonic sonorities. For example, in the “Mutig” sketch fragments, the composer frequently employs octatonic sets such as CDEFGA=B, which are derived from the 6-7 pc set of the piano part. These sets are often used to frame the vocal and piano lines, creating a sense of closure and punctuation within the musical structure. The use of octatonic sonorities is not limited to the “Mutig” fragments, but is a recurring feature throughout Webern’s atonal output. In his twelve-tone works, Webern continued to explore the potential of the octatonic scale, often employing it as a means of structuring and organizing musical material. The octatonic scale, therefore, serves as a valuable lens through which to view Webern’s atonal output, providing insight into the composer’s approach to harmonic and structural organization.  

51 Many of these characteristics are typical of Webern’s “proto-dodecaphonic” experimentation during the period in question, and similar compositional strategies can be seen in the fragmentary Kinderstück, M. 266, and “Mein Weg geht jetzt vorüber,” op. 15 no. 4. A more detailed description of the “Mutig” fragments and a comparison of these works with other sketches from the same time period is provided in Chapter 4.
octatonic collections during composition.\(^{52}\) While I believe that Webern’s reliance on this pitch resource has been overstated, a small number of his Kraus sketches demonstrate that the composer was aware of and experimented with the musical symmetries that these scales provide. A few of Webern’s Kraus sketches, most notably the 103-0791 version of “Flieder,” M. 246, clearly exhibit the intentional manipulation of octatonic sonorities on a large scale, while many others contain only traces of octatonic sets within a generally non-octatonic context. Still other works show no convincing evidence that octatonic formations played any role during composition. Even among the works in the latter category, however, the numerous interval class 1 relationships inevitably establish a musical environment in which octatonic subsets may be contrived, if the persistent analyst is willing to parse the musical material without regard for evidently musical units, for instance by subdividing linear motives into highly selective sub-groupings or by simply eliminating analytically recalcitrant pitches. When non-octatonic linear figures have clearly emerged within a sketch as melodic and texturally distinct figures, it seems dubious to dismantle and recombine these melodies analytically in a complexly contrived manner that does not reflect the spontaneous quality of the sketch. Even when octatonic subsets appear as contiguous figures, the octatonic sonorities might be solely indebted to a pattern of intervals that have been established as a basic motive; i.e., the “intent” of the composer could have been to create motivic connections rather than to compose with octatonic sets.\(^{53}\) As in all analysis, context is key. For an enthusiast, even the most contrived analyses can be interesting, yet often these analyses illuminate little regarding

\(^{52}\)The historical precedence for Webern’s use of octatonic sonorities has yet to be satisfactorily established in the research literature, but Richard Taruskin has traced the use of octatonic scales from Schubert through Liszt to the Russian composers Rimskij-Korsakov and Stravinsky; see Taruskin, “Chernomor to Kashchei: Harmonic Sorcery; or, Stravinsky’s ‘Angle,’” Journal of the American Musicological Society 38/1 (Spring 1985): 72-142. See also Pieter van den Toorn, “Taruskin’s Angle,” In Theory Only 10/3 (October 1987): 27-46.

\(^{53}\)Examples of “incidental,” motivically derived octatonic sonorities have been highlighted at several points in this study, particularly in relation to “Wiese im Park,” op. 13 no. 1. See Chapter 5, p. 334.
the aural experience of a work and may reveal even less regarding the composer’s compositional process. Still, even the conservative analytical approach adopted in this study—one that has attempted to avoid counterintuitive interpretations of the manuscript evidence—has uncovered clear indications that Webern explored the resources of the octatonic collections to varying degrees within the Kraus song sketches. On those occasions when the composer did exploit the resources of the octatonic collections, he probably did so for reasons similar to those for which he experimented with the aggregate, in an effort to create internal relationships within aggregates and phrases, to promote motivic connections, and to construct coherent larger forms.

In Webern’s earliest settings of Kraus’s poetry, the two fragmentary settings of “Wiese im Park” created in 1916, the composer wedded the technique of aggregate phrasing with the contrapuntal layering of octatonic linear figures. The aggregate phrases within these two sketches have already been described. An octatonic reading of these sketches is convincing because the most prominent linear figures can be entirely accounted for within individual octatonic sets. For instance, in the 101-0502 version of “Wiese im Park” the five-pitch violin melody, which is obviously the lead voice of the instrumental introduction and which also resolves the first aggregate on d in m. 2, comprises a 5-10 CI set. At the same time the instrumental figures in the lower staves of the introduction present two transpositions of the octatonic 6-Z49 set, one from CII and another from CIII. The stem directions that the composer drew in the manuscript support such a reading, and a telltale slanted line in m. 1 might indicate that the composer was aware that two pitches must be shared in order to complete the pair of 6-Z49 sets. After the instrumental introduction, the CIII sonority presented in the lowest staves of the introduction emerges as the harmonic basis of the vocal line in mm. 2-3, which presents a 5-16 CIII set that shares three pcs with the previous 6-Z49 CIII set. Even though the sketch quickly degenerates after the first vocal phrase, all of the pitches in the lower staff of the final fragmentary measures belong to the CII collection. In this brief sketch, the

---

54See Examples 5.1 and 5.2.
The proliferation of octatonic correspondences must be more than coincidental. Interestingly, the vertical figures in this brief sketch are not octatonic, suggesting that Webern was working with the octatonic sets in a purely linear manner.

A similar pattern emerges in the second “Wiese im Park” fragment, the version for voice and piano. This sketch also contains several purely octatonic linear figures, although the vocal line is differentiated from the harmonic background as significantly less octatonic. Like the 101-0502 version, the version for voice and piano begins with largely octatonic introductory measures that strongly emphasize the CIII octatonic collection. The piano introduction provides a complete manifestation of the CIII collection in the treble staff and the upper voices of the bass staff, a reading that is strengthened by the division of the 8-28 CIII set between the staves into two complementary (from the standpoint of octatonic formations) 4-3 sets. Numerous other octatonic sets also emerge in the texture, primarily as linear figures in the piano, and again there are no vertical octatonic sonorities. The vocal line, on the other hand, is characterized by a chromatic linear trichord that occurs in each of the first three vocal phrases (b\textsubscript{1} b\textsuperscript{1} a\textsubscript{1} in m. 3 and pcs D E= E in mm. 6 and 8) and effectively isolates the vocal line from the octatonic background provided by the piano accompaniment. The octatonic analysis of this fragment provided in Chapter 5 treats the non-octatonic or “interrupting” pitches as dissonances within the octatonic context. After the first page of this four-page sketch fragment, an octatonic analysis of the subsequent musical material becomes much less convincing. As in the case of several sketches that contain introductory aggregate phrases, the pattern of octatonic sonorities sometimes becomes more obscure and occasionally breaks down completely after the introductory measures. An eventual loss of octatonic strictness is a trait of even the most obviously octatonic of Kraus’s sketches, the 103-0791 version of “Flieder.”

None of other Kraus sketches can rival the 103-0791 sketch fragment of “Flieder” as an example of a clearly intentional octatonic compositional strategy (see Examples

\footnote{See Examples 5.3 and 5.4.}
The first two vocal pitches, along with a pc E that appears simultaneously in the instruments, also completes the piece’s first aggregate, although aggregate phrasing is not the primary compositional process at work in this sketch.

4.34 and 4.35). After an eleven-beat instrumental introduction, during which the solo glockenspiel plays a melody comprised of four interlocking octatonic tetrachords, the first vocal phrase consists of three linear strands that contrapuntally present all three octatonic collections. The vocal setting of the poem’s first nine-syllable line comprises an 8-28 CII set, while the instruments provide the 8-28 CIII and 8-28 CI sets in the second and third staves, respectively. In some phrases the composer adapted the technique of aggregate phrasing into the octatonic context, so that the appearance of the last pc of an 8-28 set marks a sectional division in the work. For example, the first two pitches of the initial vocal entrance in mm. 5-6 provide the pitches missing from the 6-Z50 CII set on the downbeat of m. 5, and the CII set of the first vocal melody in mm. 5-8 is not complete until the phrase’s final word. Although the octatonic collections are first presented in three-voice counterpoint, on another level the octatonic sets also serve a harmonic function. For example, the introductory glockenspiel solo is comprised of tetrachordal subsets from all three octatonic collections, but the solo line begins and ends on f< and a fixed-pitch 4-18 CII set, thus clearly emphasizing pc F< and setting up the sonority of the first vocal phrase. The first vocal phrase then presents all of the CII collection and resolves on f<. In the second vocal phrase, mm. 8-10, the composer exploited the relationship of only two octatonic collections, although their interrelationship becomes more complex. In this phrase the composer introduced a dissonance, c<, within an otherwise clearly CI vocal line (a 7-31 CI set without the pc C). The middle voices of this phrase are also drawn from the CI collection, but a repeated dyad in the bass emphasizes two pitches (E= and b) that coexist only in the CI collection. At the end of this phrase the dissonances represented by the “interrupting” c< of the vocal line and the repeated bass dyad are resolved into a strong CII sonority. In the instrumental interlude that follows (m. 10) the 7-31 CIII pc set on beats 2 and 3 prepares the CIII octatonic sonority that is the foundation of the third vocal phrase. Although octatonic analysis of

56The first two vocal pitches, along with a pc E that appears simultaneously in the instruments, also completes the piece’s first aggregate, although aggregate phrasing is not the primary compositional process at work in this sketch.
the following measures becomes increasing convoluted, the consciously octatonic compositional strategy behind the 103-0791 version of “Flieder” is beyond question. This analysis is further supported by the telltale lines, arrows, and curves that Webern drew to connect some of the musical figures that span more than one staff.

“Flieder” fragment 103-0791 provides strong evidence that Webern thought in terms of and experimented with octatonic scales in the summer of 1920. Paradoxically, however, the simplicity of Webern’s octatonic approach in this sketch—with its clear, contrapuntal layering of complete octatonic collections—perhaps argues against the more complex octatonic dispositions that Forte has postulated in works composed more than a decade earlier. The rather naive use of the octatonic collections seen in “Flieder” fragment 103-0791 seems obviously experimental, as if the composer was exploring a compositional approach that was new to him, and ultimately his attempt was not successful. This sketch is also very unusual among his Kraus sketches, most of which exhibit only isolated traces of octatonic formations. Whereas the octatonic collections constituted the primary thematic and pitch resource in the “Flieder” sketch, it appears that Webern most often turned to octatonic formations to create sonorities that would stand in contrast to the surrounding, generally non-octatonic musical context. For instance, the repeated “machine-gun” chords that constitute a recurring thematic device in the “Vision des Erblindeten” continuity draft consistently comprise subsets of the octatonic collections, although much of the other music simply does not support such an analysis. Likewise, in the “Vallorbe” continuity draft the 5-19 CII pentachord that sounds three times in the accompanying instruments as the voice sings “das in den Mai mir fiel” (that came to me in May) brilliantly accents the reference to May precisely because the sonority is unusual. Otherwise, there are very few convincingly octatonic sets in the “Vallorbe” continuity draft, a sketch that was definitely created through aggregate phrasing and then substantially revised to enhance a network of motivic connections. The same is true for the final version of “Wiese im Park, op. 13 no. 1. Although this work opens with two different transpositions of the 4-18 CIII set—a linear version in the first vocal line and a vertical version in the wind instruments on the downbeat of m. 2—these
sets seem coincidental in the larger, highly chromatic and non-octatonic context.

**Webern’s Period of Experimentation: Toward a More Comprehensive Overview**

Webern later recalled that the atonal years between 1908-1923 had been “incredibly difficult,”57 describing them as a period of “catastrophe . . . [and] feverish struggles”58 in which “it seemed as if the light had been extinguished . . . then everything was in a state of unstable dark flux.”59 More specifically, Webern recalled his frustration at his inability to fashion a musical language that could sustain musical ideas and, in turn, support large-scale structures. The Kraus manuscripts document many of the methods with which Webern experimented as he tried to formulate a musical language that would accommodate the composition of coherent Lieder within the atonal idiom. These manuscripts reveal only a small part of the process, however, and the study and comparison of Webern’s Kraus manuscripts does not reveal a clear developmental direction or “path” when viewed in isolation. They must be more firmly placed within the larger context of Webern’s extant Nachlaß. Despite the common text source, Webern’s Kraus manuscripts do not constitute a cohesive set of compositional materials, scattered as they are throughout the Webern’s vocal decade and interspersed among and

57Path, 51. “It sounds grotesque, incomprehensible, and it was incredibly difficult.” See Der Weg zur Neuen Musik, 55. “Es klingt grotesk, unbegreiflich, und es war unerhört schwer.”

58Path, 48. “I say this not so that it will get into my biography, but because I want to show that it was a development wrested out of feverish struggles and decisively necessary.” See Der Weg zur Neuen Musik, 52. “Ich sage dies nicht, damit es in meine Biographie komme, sondern weil ich zeigen will, daß es eine heißen Kämpfen errungene Entwicklung ist, die entschieden notwendig war.”

59Path, 54. “For tonality was supremely important in producing self-contained forms. As if the light has been put out!—that’s how it seemed. At the time everything was in a state of flux—uncertain, dark, very stimulating and exciting, so that there wasn’t time to notice the loss.” See Der Weg zur Neuen Musik, 58. “Denn zur Herbeiführung formaler Geschlossenheit war die Tonalität höchst wichtig. Als ob das Licht erloschen wäre!—so schien es. . . . Damals war alles in unsicherem, dunkelm Flusse—sehr an- und aufregend, so daß die Zeit fehlte, den Verlust zu merken.”
between numerous sketches on texts from various sources. Shreffler’s study of the Trakl settings suffered from the same problem, although that study stood a better chance of creating a comprehensive description of select brief periods, such as 1919, when Webern set Trakl texts almost exclusively—except of course for the continuity draft of “Vision des Erblindeten.” In other years, however, the Trakl settings are intersected by numerous other sketch fragments that have yet to be closely scrutinized. Such research is of course a cumulative process, and both the Kraus and Trakl sketches will need to be reviewed in the light of the information that is gathered from the still unstudied sketches. Many other manuscripts from this same time period also deserve more attention. The value of studying even the most fragmentary of Webern’s middle period sketches has been clearly demonstrated in this study. As several of the most fragmentary Kraus manuscripts have shown, these pristine musical conceptions bear the immediacy of the composer’s initial inspiration and reveal the earliest processes by which he fashioned the musical material. As later revisions created additional correspondences between parts and sections, the earliest layers of composition often become less and less accessible, and many layers of Webern’s compositional process have thus been obliterated.

In order to broaden the understanding of Webern’s compositional development during this period, all of the available manuscript material must be brought under comparable scrutiny. Several sketch fragments that were created in the same year as the “Wiese im Park” continuity draft (1917) have not been adequately described in the research literature. These include a 38-measure sketch fragment on Goethe’s “Gegenwart,” M. 220, and a series of three sketch fragments that preceded the published version of “Fahr hin, o Seel’,” op. 15 no. 5. From 1918 there are four diverse fragmentary settings of Goethe’s “Cirrus,” M. 235, and an entire continuity draft setting of “Nächtliches Bild,” M. 233, one of Bethge’s translations from Die chinesische Flöte. It would certainly be interesting to examine these works for evidence of the extensive aggregate phrasing that is fundamental in the “Vallorbe” draft, also created that year. Between Shreffler’s work and this study, all of the extant manuscripts from 1919 have been studied, but from 1920 there are two recently identified fragmentary settings of
Goethe’s “Christkindlein trägt die Sünden der Welt,” M. 245, and three fragmentary settings of Bethge’s “Der Frühlingsregen,” M. 244. Labor-intensive as such an endeavor will be, a chronological and comprehensive overview of these materials is necessary, if we are to understand more fully Webern’s compositional development between 1914 and 1924 as the continuous, multi-directional, self-referential, and ultimately experimental process that it truly was.
APPENDIX A

“VALLORBE,” M. 232

Reconstruction of the Continuity Draft
PSS 103-0775 through 103-0778
"Vallorbe," M. 232, continuity draft
Anton Webern, 1918

Edited by Jerry M. Cain
Mai mir fiel, du Thal der Thäler du, traum-tiefes Thal der Orbel

Du Sonntag der Natur, hier sei-tah war die Ruh.

Ursprung der Zeit! So hat, da alles
war ge- glückt, der Schöp fer die- sen Kuß der

Schöp- fung auf- ge- drückt, hier saß der Gott am Weg zum gu- ten Lac de

Jous. Du Gra- de, die ver- weht den nie-be- sieg- ten Wahn, wie an- ders war es

da, und da entstand die Zeit, die-weiβ sie stau-nend still stand vor der

Ewigkeit. Wie blau ist doch die Welt vom Schöpfer aufge-"tham!\n
5. VII 1918
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