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ABSTRACT

In this dissertation, I address several ways in which Richard Strauss elaborates the Classical-model sentence and period paradigm described by William E. Caplin (1998): through harmonic elaborations by way of Strauss’s chromatic, Romantic-style harmonic palette; through formal elaborations by way of phrase expansion; or through elaborations of many musical parameters, which yield hybrid variants of sentences and periods. I offer labels for these hybrids based on their melodic-motivic, harmonic, and phrase-length profile: the Straussian Hybrid Sentence, the Straussian Hybrid Period, and the Lone Antecedent Phrase. These labels encapsulate a sense of their musical shape, showing how the resulting formal structures derive from familiar Classical models, but in Strauss-specific ways.

After a review of relevant literature on form theories and Schenkerian approaches to chromatic music, I present in Chapter 1 my methodology for analyzing Strauss’s songs, which responds to Janet Schmalfeldt’s 1991 article on reconciling form-function theory with Schenkerian theory and analysis. It is often the case that where Strauss obfuscates normative Classical themetypes, he embeds the inherent unification of their formal structure in other ways, namely through voice leading and the melodic-motivic interplay between voice and piano. Accordingly, I present form overlays and voice-leading sketches for each song excerpt or full-song analysis. By so doing, I highlight how one kind of analysis informs the other, especially when one or the other does not seem to fully account for a particular passage of music on its own. As such, the form overlays and voice-leading sketches work in tandem with my analyses of poetic structure, meaning, and text-setting.

In Chapter 2, I investigate Classical-model sentences, sixteen-measure sentences, and Straussian hybrid sentences in excerpts from seven songs. Instances of Classical-model sentences

In Chapter 3, I analyze examples of Classical-model periods, in addition to two related categories: the Straussian Hybrid Period and the Lone Antecedent Phrase. Straussian Hybrid Periods comprise a normative antecedent phrase (4-bar compound basic idea, ending with a weak cadence) followed by a hybrid consequent phrase that is guised as one of several possible formal outcomes, such as a sentence, a continuation phrase (like Caplin’s Hybrid 1 model), or a cadential unit (like Caplin’s Hybrid 2 model). In any of these three cases, the hybrid consequent phrase ends with a stronger cadence than the one at the end of the antecedent phrase. The final formal structure I address is the Lone Antecedent Phrase, which describes an antecedent phrase that is not followed by a consequent phrase, whether normative or hybrid. In these cases, it is difficult to speak of a “true” periodic design; rather, the first half of a perceived period is present, but there is no musical (or even rhetorical) completion of a complementary musical unit. In all, I survey six excerpts: “Für fünfzehn Pfennige,” Op. 36, No. 2, and “Ach weh unglückhaften Mann,” Op. 21, No. 4 (Classical-model periods); “Mit deinen blauen Augen,” Op. 56, No. 4, “Die Zeitlose,” Op. 10, No. 7, and “Schön

In Chapter 4, I provide three full-song analyses: “Zueignung,” Op. 10, No. 1, “Allerseelen,” and “Befreit.” Through analyses at multiple levels of formal and voice-leading structure, I highlight the inherent interaction between these two musical parameters, showing specifically how they relate to the poetry. In “Zueignung” and “Allerseelen,” there is a progression from obscurity to clarity that spans the song. Conversely, the poem from which “Befreit” is derived poses the opposite rhetorical effect—that is, “Befreit” traces a progression from clarity to obscurity. The analyses presented in Chapter 4 depict how Strauss’s elaborations of Classical theme-types are done so in the service of conveying poetic meaning throughout the song.
CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION, REVIEW OF LITERATURE, AND METHODOLOGY

1. Introduction and Contextualization

1.1. Introduction

Richard Strauss was no stranger to the Classical style; in fact, his compositional process is said to have been motivated by the music of the high Classical era.1 In an essay on this topic, Walter Werbeck (2010) notes that

the invention of themes and their elaboration into larger complexes stood at the center of Strauss’s compositional practice. […] Strauss emphasized again and again that what came to him initially were themes of two to four measures, and that the act of composing consisted of expanding these themes to eight, sixteen, or thirty-two measures. It has been reported that he likewise instructed his few composition students to develop a short melodic structure into ‘a larger melodic arch of sixteen to thirty-two measures.’ Strauss’s consistency is remarkable: over a period of nearly fifty years he advised composers to invent ‘Classical’ themes with period metric structures. […] Naturally Strauss’s enthusiasm for Mozart also played an essential role.2

Though Werbeck’s exact definition of “theme” is unclear here (as the term’s possible meanings are numerous), his comment about “themes of two to four measures” and “larger melodic arch[es] of sixteen to thirty-two measures” invites an investigation of how closely or distantly related these “themes” might be to some of the Classical “theme-types” defined by William E. Caplin (1998 and 2009).3 Since the 1998 publication of his treatise on formal functions and theme-types in the Classical era, Caplin and an assortment of other scholars4 have independently investigated many

---

2 Ibid., 23 (italics mine).
4 I address contributions made by other scholars in the Review of Literature (pp. 4–21).
ways in which the parameters of Classical theme-types are expanded and extended in non-Classical-era music. Recently, Caplin describes how harmonic and formal expectations are different in the early Romantic era than they are in the Classical era. He notes that, besides a general effusiveness in Romantic-era harmony and form, composers of the early Romantic era favor circularity in formal organization, blurring the crystalline Classical model that serves as the baseline of Caplin’s methodology. The circularity to which Caplin refers is a general departure from the Classical premise that the melodic-motivic material presented in a theme’s basic idea undergoes a process of “liquidation” as the theme nears its cadence. For Romantic composers, melodic-motivic material from the basic idea is often involved in—if not comprises—a theme’s cadence rather than liquidating and disappearing by the time the cadence arrives. The result is a distortion of formal functions: is the cadence truly cadential in function if it derives its melodic-motivic material from the presentation’s basic idea? The significance of tracing these kinds of developments from the Classical to the Romantic era allows us to (1) investigate the presence of Classical-era-derived theme-types in the Romantic era; (2) situate these theme-types, if they exist, within a broader consideration of how Romantic-era composers were expanding and extending Classical techniques; and (3) begin to classify and define these musical structures, which remains in dialogue with recent research on similar topics.

1.2. Scope and Purpose of the Project

In an effort to make sense of Classical-like themes in the Romantic era, I borrow James Hepokoski and Warren Darcy’s (2006) principle of “deformation.” The collaborative effort of these two scholars, namely *Elements of Sonata Theory*, is a mainstay in dialogues on musical form. The term

---

6 Ibid., 1.
“deformation,” first popularized independently by Warren Darcy,\(^7\) was later refined by these two scholars as a way to explain “how varying degrees of the normative can be altered, stretched, or occasionally overridden altogether[.]\(^8\) The authors make clear that deformations are not a negative compositional aspect; rather, the deviation from an expected pattern or model renders each phrase, each piece a distinct musical entity.\(^9\) As an extension of this principle, I contend that Classical-like theme-types arise in the music of Richard Strauss, which are in dialogue with, and as deformations of, stricter Classical models. The goal of this project, then, is to identify the particular Classical theme-types that arise specifically in Strauss’s songs for voice and piano—primarily sentences and, to a lesser extent, periods. I then categorize them according to how they depart from the Classical tradition, noting specifically how formal functions are either expanded, extended, or missing. Lastly, I engage the dramatic elements embedded within the theme-types, highlighting how their rhetorical aspects correspond with the effusiveness of late-nineteenth- and early-twentieth-century music.

The analysis of Classical theme-types, namely the sentence and the period, in texted and instrumental music outside of the Classical era is a popular endeavor in current music theory scholarship, thanks in large part to Matthew BaileyShea, Michael Callahan, William E. Caplin, Frank Lehman, Mark Richards, Stephen Rodgers, and Steven Vande Moortele. These scholars, among others, have offered a great deal of insight concerning the ways in which many post-Classical composers have integrated Classical-model theme-types in their music. Following in their footsteps, my project first aims to engage with them in the dialogue on theme-types in post-Classical music by adding specifically to the extant literature on form (1) in late-nineteenth- and early-twentieth-century music, (2) in texted music, and (3) in the songs of Richard Strauss—for which there is presently little


\(^8\) James Hepokoski and Warren Darcy, *Elements of Sonata Theory: Norms, Types, and Deformations in the Late-Eighteenth-Century Sonata* (Oxford University Press, 2006), i.

\(^9\) Ibid., 614–616.
scholarly analytical literature. In addition, I develop at least a preliminary methodology for analyzing theme-types in the songs of Richard Strauss, and I have attempted to do so in a way that makes my methodology applicable to the music of other Romantic and late-Romantic composers.

Second, my project also picks up the thread of reconciling Schenkerian concepts with form theories introduced by Janet Schmalfeldt in 1991. What I have learned from Schmalfeldt’s work and from my own formal and Schenkerian analyses of Strauss’s songs is that coupling these two analytic approaches reveals their complementary nature: what one approach might not account for, the other one might, and vice versa. Furthermore, there is often a misalignment of form and harmony in Strauss’s songs, and the pairing of formal and Schenkerian analysis both highlights and tells us something about the rhetorical aspects of these ambiguities.

Third, and finally, my project offers to the existing literature a set of harmonic and voice-leading analyses of Strauss’s songs. This goal is practical in nature, but, as I mentioned above, the corpus of such analyses is small, especially those of Strauss’s lesser-known songs (of which there are many). In sum, my project begins to familiarize a musical territory that is as yet uncharted but nestled within a larger territory of scholarly precedent on similar topics.

2. Review of Literature

2.1. Literature on Form

2.1.1. William E. Caplin

William E. Caplin’s (1998) oft-cited treatise, Classical Form: A Theory of Formal Functions for the Instrumental Music of Haydn, Mozart, and Beethoven, has served as the basis for many studies on musical

---

form since its publication some twenty years ago. Caplin states immediately in the introduction to his treatise that “[t]he time is ripe for a new theory of classical form.”11 His sentiment not only triggered a resurgence of Formenlehre scholarship, but it also sparked interest in non-Classical-era form. In his assessment of Classical formal functions12 and theme-types,13 he makes clear the exact purpose and scope of his theory: (1) it is based on music of a single style (the high Viennese Classical style, ca. 1780–1810); (2) it emphasizes the role of local harmonic progression as a determinant of form; (3) it clearly distinguishes formal function from grouping-structure; (4) it minimizes motivic content as a criterion of formal function; (5) it establishes strict formal categories but applies them flexibly in analyses; (6) it is not a comprehensive account of “form” in music; (7) it does not include late-eighteenth- and early-nineteenth-century accounts of form; and (8) it is empirical and descriptive, not deductive and prescriptive.14

Though Caplin’s theory is comprehensive in its account of form in high Viennese Classicism, it admittedly leaves open the possibility for further work on form in non-Classical styles. To be sure, his theory is a useful tool for studies in form; his rigorous taxonomy and now-familiar terminology serve as a wonderful foundation on which to build new theories of form, especially those whose goal, like mine, is to convey form in post-Classical music that remains in dialogue with Classical models. From Caplin’s theory I adapt the sentence and period theme-types, with references to hybrid themes, too; but rather than summarize each of these theme-types here, I fold in descriptions of their primary characteristics (which, to many, are now common-knowledge) in the following sections of this chapter.

11 Caplin, Classical Form, 3.
12 A “formal function” is defined by Caplin as the specific role played by a particular musical passage in the formal organization of a work. It generally expresses a temporal sense of beginning, middle, end, before-the-beginning, or after-the-end. More specifically, it can express a wide variety of formal characteristics and relationships. Ibid., 254–255.
13 A “theme-type” is defined by Caplin as a unit consisting of a conventional set of initiating, medial, and ending intrathematic functions. It must close with a cadence. Ibid., 257.
Before addressing more recent research on Formenlehre scholarship by other theorists, I should note that Caplin (2018) has now begun expanding his theory to account for early-Romantic music, examining in detail the following concepts: (1) a more extensive use of chromaticism and dissonance, (2) a greater emphasis on root-position harmonies, (3) a more uniform harmonic rhythm and harmonic density, (4) a circularity of formal organization, (5) an ambiguity between sequential and cadential harmonies, (6) a lack of cadential closure for thematic units, and (7) an ambiguity between penultimate and ultimate dominants at points of potential cadence. For the purposes of my own research, I attend specifically to points (1), (3), and (4) above. In sum, Caplin’s extensions to his original research present new and exciting possibilities for the ways in which we study form in post-Classical music.

2.1.2. Stephen Rodgers

Among the Formenlehre literature on theme-types, especially the sentence, Stephen Rodgers’s (2014) research on sentence structure in Schubert’s Die schöne Müllerin addresses what many authors have not: theme-types in texted music. As one would expect for the dialogic Lieder repertoire, Rodgers attends equitably to the vocal line, the accompaniment, and the text, and, by so doing, Rodgers offers these three principles for his analysis of sentences in Schubert’s song cycle:

(1) “[w]e will need] to broaden our understanding of what Schubert’s sentential modes were, looking beyond instrumental music to the sentences found in vocal music of his day”;

(2) “[w]e will see that Schubert’s sentences often go hand in hand with poems that begin with rhyming couplets, and that when this isn’t the case [in the poetry there invariably exists musical ‘rhymes’ among] the statement and repetition of a ‘basic idea.’ ”;


“[w]e will also discover that the specific form a sentence takes […] often correlates with the structure and sense of the poetry associated with it.”¹⁷

In general, Rodgers expands the Caplinian model of sentence structure—the strict pairing of melodic-motivic and harmonic-tonal environments—to Schubert’s song cycle, considering elements of text-music relationships in melody and accompaniment that are not included in Caplin’s analysis of theme-types in instrumental music.

In a related study, Rodgers (2017) examines another of Caplin’s theme-types—the period—in a selection of Schubert’s songs.¹⁸ Here, above all, Rodgers is most concerned with the expressive potential articulated by the period’s symmetrical structure; this contrasts his aforementioned article on *Die schöne Müllerin*, in which he incorporates a more equal balance between the Caplinian melodic-motivic/harmonic-tonal and expressive qualities of sentences. However, Rodgers notes carefully that there is expressive potential inherent to all theme-types, but the onus is placed on the composer to reveal it:

> It may seem strange to speak of the meaning of a period. After all, a theme-type (or any formal type) might be seen as nothing more than an abstract model, not meaningful in its own right but only potentially meaningful, depending upon how that abstract model is realized. In Schubert’s music, however, the choice of one theme-type over another (whether a period, a sentence, a hybrid, a small ternary form, or a deviation from one of these forms) often has profound expressive implications. This is particularly true in his Lieder, where the shapes of his melodies often interact in striking ways with the structure and sense of poetry associated with them.¹⁹

In sum, Rodgers adds to the analysis of Classical theme-types a consideration of some musical parameters not found in Caplin’s research, namely their expressive potential and the ways in which these rhetorical aspects of the music are illuminated by their relationship to the poetry. In so doing, Rodgers’s commentary on the rhetoric of periods invites an investigation of whether or not other

---

¹⁷ Ibid., 59.
¹⁹ Ibid., 225.
theme-types, like the sentence, perhaps, have embedded rhetorical aspects, which is a question that Matthew BaileyShea considers in some of his research.

2.1.3. Matthew BaileyShea

Like Stephen Rodgers, Matthew BaileyShea (2002) has identified Classical theme-types in post-Classical music, particularly in the works of Richard Wagner.20 (Wagner was Strauss’s predecessor, contemporary, and, most importantly, his model.) However, BaileyShea’s research focuses primarily on loosely knit sentences in the orchestration of Wagner’s operas rather than attending greatly to the vocal line or the text—an approach that is less “multivalent” than that of Rodgers in terms of its breadth and attention to the voice, the piano, and the text.21 Despite this difference in methodology, BaileyShea posits a number of important concepts relating to the expansion of Caplin’s sentence theme-type and its extension to Romantic and late-Romantic music.

First, BaileyShea addresses the presentation phrase in Wagnerian sentences, claiming that (1) the model-sequence technique and sequential repetitions are quite prevalent, and that (2) they are often followed by some kind of liquidation leading to a cadence.22 Specifically, the model-sequence technique and sequential repetitions render Wagnerian sentences considerably more loosely knit than the Classical sentence model; however, the ways in which Wagner loosens his sentences are either the same as, or in close dialogue with, the Classical sentence-loosening procedures outlined by Caplin.23 In fact, BaileyShea argues that “many of the sequential passages in Wagner’s music can be heard as expansions or distortions of conventional sentence proportions. In particular, the basic hyper-rhythmic gesture of the sentence—the proportion short : short : long—is often expanded

21 For more information on “multivalent” approaches to formal analysis, see James Webster, “Formenlehre in Theory and Practice,” in Musical Form, Forms, and Formenlehre: Three Methodological Reflections, ed. Pieter Bergé (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2009), 123–139.
with extra statements of the basic idea at different sequential levels.” As such, BaileyShea’s findings are intuitively related to the Romantic and late-Romantic ideals of expanding and obfuscating Classical norms. These are the same types of loosening and deformational procedures I observe in the songs of Richard Strauss.

Second, BaileyShea addresses the continuation phrase of Wagnerian sentences in terms of the “Stollen Process,” which is defined by William Rothstein as

[the progressive setting up Stollen, or first parts of bar forms (or sentences), in such a way that the fulfilling Abgesang or cadential segment is pushed farther and farther into the indefinite future—finally, perhaps to be elided altogether, or (more likely) transformed].

BaileyShea’s point is twofold: first, he acknowledges that the “Stollen Process” is one loosening technique in Wagnerian sentences; second, he uses this notion to situate his analysis of Wagnerian sentences between the expansion of the Classical model and the inherent dramatic and expressive potential of sentences. He notes that a sentence’s proportions point toward a cadence (even if it is denied), propelling a forward motion where potential energy in the presentation phrase is released as kinetic energy in the sentence’s continuation phrase.

Like Rodgers, BaileyShea is interested in the rhetorical possibilities that sentences can convey, expanding their status from formal structure to rhetorical-compositional device that serves well the drama of story-telling through song. In fact, he has recently posited the notion that the structure of musical sentences arose from the poetic structure of limericks. Just as BaileyShea has commented on the properties of potential and kinetic energy in sentence structure, he also realizes this same paradigm in limericks—that is, the first two lines of limerick comprise and idea and its

25 Ibid., 13.
28 BaileyShea first brought to my attention this connection between the structure of sentences and the poetic structure of limericks in a Fall 2018 guest lecture at Florida State University. For a thorough investigation of these ideas, see Matthew BaileyShea, “The Poetic Pre-History of Sentence Form,” Music Theory Spectrum, 41, no. 1 (2019): 126–145.
restatement (sometimes abstractly), followed by three shorter lines which fragment the core of the aforesaid idea and add details in order to complete a full thought. Take, for example, the following limerick—penned by myself—and notice the similarities between aspects of poetic meter, organization, and rhyme scheme as they relate to the Classical sentence paradigm (please note that accented words and syllables are underlined):

1. I came up with this lim’rick for you = basic idea
   this morning while tying my shoe; = basic idea (repeated)
   so I hope that it’s fun. = fragment (in continuation)
   ‘cause it gets the job done— = fragment (in continuation)
   for it works as a great model, too! = liquidation, progression to cadence

As we can see from this limerick, its constituents highlight the formal, organizational, and rhetorical properties of the Classical-model sentence paradigm. As such, the inherent forward motion of limericks relates to the propulsion of the sentence paradigm. In all, through his proposition of limericks as forebears of musical sentences, BaileyShea is able to map the rhetorical attributes of particular poetic structures to the expressive potential of the musical sentence.

2.1.4 Other Scholars on Form

In terms of a theme-type’s dramatic potential, Stephen Rodgers and Matthew BaileyShea agree, but they are not the only two scholars who have done so. In studies of more recent music, Michael Callahan (2013), Frank Lehman (2013), and Mark Richards (2016) have investigated the rhetorical and interpretive possibilities of sentences and other theme-types in Tin Pan Alley, Broadway, and Film music. These scholars have reworked Caplinian principles in order to clarify, classify, and typify theme-types in non-Classical music based on their intuitive structural parameters established by Classical composers and categorized by Caplin. In sum, there exists a trend among

---

these scholars, and others, toward loosening Caplinian principles in a variety of ways, such as: (1) identifying theme-types that span greater musical space than eight-, sixteen-, or even thirty-two-measures; (2) identifying theme-types outside of the strict harmonic underpinnings and progressions outlined by Caplin (especially in the presentation phrase); (3) placing greater emphasis on melodic phenomena; and (4) identifying phrase boundaries in the midst of loose cadential markers.

2.2. Bridging the Gap: Janet Schmalfeldt on Formal and Schenkerian Perspectives

Janet Schmalfeldt (1991) proposes and advocates for a dual approach to analysis, reconciling Schenkerian principles with traditional theories of musical form. The premise of her argument is that two organicist-classicists, Schenker and Schoenberg, “endowed form with the capacity for balance though the continual interaction between parts and whole within a hierarchic design.” In other words, Schmalfeldt emphasizes that whether or not these two theorists regarded the generative process of music as foreground-to-background (Schoenberg) or background-to-foreground (Schenker), the interwoven units at any structural level still relate to one another to create a unified whole. As such, her dual approach to music analysis borrows from Schoenberg, Ratz, and Caplin’s earliest manifestations of form-function theory a strict analysis of theme-types (and their constituent units) and pairs it with a Schenkerian voice-leading analysis of the underlying counterpoint in these theme-types. What Schmalfeldt aims to reveal is that Schoenbergian—and thus Caplinian—and Schenkerian principles can be illuminated and informed by one another, especially when elements of form and voice leading appear unclear or only partially accounted for by one style of analysis alone.
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30 I use the term “dual approach” in my writing; it relates specifically to the combination of form-function and Schenkerian analyses.
32 Ibid., 233.
For example, if the harmonic responsibility of the sentence’s presentation phrase is to prolong tonic, one would expect to find at a foreground level the prolongation of tonic by way of paradigmatic counterpoint and voice leading. Similarly, if the harmonic responsibility of a sentence’s continuation phrase is to fragment and eventually liquidate the basic idea at the cadence, one would expect to find at a foreground level a melodic descent toward the cadence with coordinated bass-line counterpoint. The usefulness of Schmalfeldt’s dual approach is seen most clearly when one investigates theme-types that do not adhere strictly to the parameters of the Classical style, namely many of those observed in late-nineteenth- and early-twentieth-century music. In these instances, the pairing of formal and voice-leading analyses often reveals what is not fully accounted for or made obvious by only one system or the other.

2.3. Literature on Schenkerian Theory, Analysis, and Perspectives

In my adaptation of Janet Schmalfeldt’s dual approach to the analysis of Strauss’s songs, it is necessary to consider two elements of Schenkerian theory as it applies to my corpus of study: first, I describe Schenkerian views on how chromaticism relates to form, specifically by way of formal excursions and phrase expansions; and second, I outline a number of scholars’ Schenkerian approaches to chromatic music, focusing especially on how each of their viewpoints responds to or prompts a refinement of the approaches taken by other scholars.

2.3.1. Principles of Chromaticism in Der freie Satz: Matthew Brown, Douglass Dempster, and Dave Headlam

In my dual approach to analyzing Strauss’s songs, the simple identification of parenthetical passages is not the end goal; rather, these passages must also be considered in terms of their overall voice leading. The inherent challenge of this process is conveying clearly chromatic passages in a way that abides by the tenets and practices of Schenkerian theory and analysis. Handling a chromatic foreground and middleground is something to which Heinrich Schenker gave much thought as he
broadened his theory in *Der freie Satz* ([1935] 1979). As Matthew Brown (1986) explains, no longer did Schenker present in *Der freie Satz* that the generating triad is a vertical sonority; rather, he regarded it as a contrapuntal complex—that is, the *Ursatz* comprises the *Urlinie* and the *Bassbrechung*. Furthermore, the generating triad now controls the harmonic structure of an entire composition, which built upon Schenker’s earlier idea in *Harmonielehre* ([1906] 1954) that it controls only a local key area. Instead of changing systems with each new key area, Schenker’s idea of structural levels allows for chromaticism and even modulation to be accounted for within a monotonal system. Similarly, key relations, such as the relative major and minor, are accounted for by such voice-leading motions as passing or neighbor tones, and/or linear progressions.34

For Schenker, chromaticism was not limited to the foreground or early middleground levels; rather, he argues that chromaticism may participate in the deep middleground level in three possible ways: (1) through the prolongation of the fundamental line, specifically through mixture and the Phrygian II; (2) through mixture in the *Bassbrechung*, where the intervening II–III–IV of the bass arpeggiation may appear in chromatic form; and (3) through tonicization of the bass *Stufen*—most commonly as #IV7 (applied chord to V) or IV6 (“German” augmented-sixth chord).35 Schenker’s ideas on chromaticism in the foreground and middleground levels highlight the advantages of his theory with respect to the close relationship among diatonic and chromatic chords. First, his system is both generative—because he bases his theory of harmonic relations on the tonic triad, and because he believes that mixture, tonicization, and fifth relations are properties of the triad—and transformational (in the pre-Lewinian sense)—because the tonic triad can create all other triads. Second, because his theory is based on the tonic triad, consonant intervals gain meaning as they
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appear in the major and minor modes. Furthermore, the horizontal representation of harmonies relates directly to prolongation. Third, Schenker’s theory accounts for all tonal phenomena by way of positing that the seven diatonic *Stufen*, and their chromatic counterparts, can participate in the same types of prolongation. Consequently, Schenker rejects Riemann’s theory of harmonic functions, claiming that the tonic, dominant, and subdominant triads do not (and cannot) account for all tonal progressions.\(^{36}\) In sum, as Schenker continued to develop his theory in *Der freie Satz*, he accounted for a broader sense of the ways in which chromaticism enters, but does not destroy, the premise of tonal music.

Schenker was careful to determine the limits of tonality. Noting this, Matthew Brown, Douglas Dempster, and Dave Headlam (1997), test these limits by way of their \(\#IV(bV)\) Hypothesis.\(^{37}\) The authors’ hypothesis follows Schenker’s notion that \(\#IV(bV)\) is indirectly related to the tonic; as such, \(\#IV(bV)\) may only arise in three different ways in tonal music: (1) as a tonicization of the structural dominant, (2) as part of an arpeggiation of other *Stufe* (possibly \(bIII/bIII\)), or (3) within expanded passing or neighbor motion. If a piece of music fails to conform to one of these three criteria, it is deemed atonal.\(^{38}\) These principles respond to Gregory Proctor (1978), who, rather than adopting Schenker’s criteria for distinguishing the corpus of tonal music as a singular category, suggests that tonal music ought to be divided into two categories: “classical diatonic tonality” (described by Schenker) and “nineteenth-century tonality” (derived from the chromatic scale).\(^{39}\) Brown, Dempster, and Headlam refute the claim that a separate category for highly chromatic, yet

\(^{36}\) Brown, “The Diatonic and the Chromatic,” 12–14.


\(^{38}\) Ibid., 160–166, 182.

tonal, music is necessary; rather, they explain that the generative properties of Schenker’s theory in Der freie Satz are perfectly suited to both minimally and highly chromatic music (though the sketches of such pieces will look quite different, of course).

As mentioned above, Schenker’s stance on chromaticism broadened significantly in Der freie Satz, but many scholars still perceived gaps in his theory with respect to the handling of chromatic music. The task of filling in these gaps has become the fascination of many Schenkerian, non-Schenkerian, and nineteenth-century music scholars. In the following paragraphs, I will discuss briefly the scope of a number of scholars who have dedicated a significant amount of research in response to this issue. The first three scholars—Gregory Proctor, Patrick McCreless, and William Mitchell—propose the abandonment of a strictly diatonic system; the second two—Richard Kaplan and Robert Morgan—respond to Proctor and McCreless, arguing for the retention of a truly diatonic system.

2.3.2. Challenges to Traditional Schenkerian Approaches: Gregory Proctor, Patrick McCreless, and William Mitchell

Gregory Proctor (1978) contests Schenker’s notion that a strictly diatonic background exists in the nineteenth century; instead, he suggests that there exists two systems of tonality at the beginning of the century: “classical diatonic tonality,” where chromaticism appears within a diatonic framework, and “nineteenth-century tonality,” where the twelve-tone chromatic scale becomes a generative property of background structures—that is, the diatonic background of “classical tonality” becomes nonexistent in “nineteenth century tonality.”^40^ As such, the tenets of Proctor’s theory run contrary to the tenets of Schenker’s theory. Proctor and Schenker collide at the intersection of where mixture, tonicization, and chromatic voice leading participate either at all

structural levels (Proctor) or only as far as the deep middleground level (Schenker). In sum, Proctor’s “nineteenth-century tonality” might be more enticing for the analysis of very densely chromatic works such as Strauss’s middle-period works, like Salome, Op. 54 (1905), and Elektra, Op. 58 (1909), rather than for the songs I present in this project.

Building on Proctor’s research, Patrick McCreless (1996) views chromaticism in many nineteenth-century works as “independent paths through the chromatic tonal space instead of, or at least as well as, broad inflections of a stable diatonic space.” Furthermore, McCreless traces the trajectory from diatonicism to a “harmonically based chromatic tonal space,” citing Mahler, Strauss, and Wagner as representative composers whose music—in some cases—exhibits chromatic background structures. His defense for a non-Schenkerian chromatic background comes from his conclusion that although chromatic events—such as sequences—appear on early-middleground levels, and although a deep-middleground analysis of these chromatic events can reveal a truly diatonic space, nineteenth-century music “leaps” into and out of chromatic space so pervasively that we are demanded to hear it in chromatic space—with a chromatic background—rather than in diatonic space.
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43 Ibid., 98 (McCreless’s emphasis).
44 Ibid., 102–103. I suspect that McCreless’s ideas here serve, in large part, his distinction between “event space” and “tonal space.” “Event space involves our ability to hear, comprehend, abstract, and imagine ordered musical events in real time. It is the ordered musical structure inferred by listeners from performed pieces. Tonal space, on the other hand, is atemporal; it is the mental pitch or pitch-class schema through which we interpret the music that we hear. It is the atemporal tonal and harmonic mental set—the filter, as it were—that enables us to process tonal music and make sense of it. Event space and tonal space are interdependent” (Ibid., 96–97). However, the interdependence of these two “spaces” breaks down when a chromatic tonal space is chosen over a diatonic tonal space. In this way, the idea of diatonicism is removed from the equation and the interdependence that Schenker accounts for in his theory—between the generative, diatonic background and the chromatic foreground and middleground levels—is lost. In sum, “event space” and “tonal space” are no longer interdependent, and the excitement and rhetorical beauty of nineteenth-century music’s chromatic, transitory musical surface and middleground is lost when the music is accounted for by an entirely chromatic tonal space.
William Mitchell, though a predecessor of both Proctor and McCreless, blurred the lines between a non-Schenkerian and a Schenkerian approach to chromaticism; however, through a traceable lineage, many of his ideas are present in the work of Proctor and McCreless. Mitchell (1962) provides two ways in which chromaticism appears in diatonic textures: by “interpolation” and by “replacement.”\textsuperscript{45} Interpolation describes the use of the chromatic half-step between two diatonic scale degrees as a generative source of chromaticism (related to the twelve-tone chromatic scale). Replacement—often an abbreviated interpolation—occurs when a chromatic variant substitutes for a diatonic scale degree. In order to clarify these terms, Mitchell offers four functions of chromaticism that classify interpolation and replacement in music: degree identification, degree progression, degree inflection, and degree transformation. Degree identification and degree progression concern chromaticism as it relates to structural tones, namely their determinable relationship to the generative tonic triad; degree inflection allows for identical meanings to be understood when chromatically altered scale steps are present; and degree transformation, an aspect of enharmonic reinterpretation, allows a given pitch to express meaning other than (or in addition to) its actual spelling.\textsuperscript{46} Mitchell’s ideas of interpolation and replacement situate chromatic events within a framework that can be either diatonic or chromatic—that is, the tonic triad or the twelve-tone chromatic scale can be the generative force behind chromatic music. In all, remnants of non-Schenkerian and Schenkerian approaches to chromatic music remain a part of his research.

2.3.3. Responses to Proctor, McCreless, and Mitchell—Maintaining a Diatonic System: Richard Kaplan and Robert Morgan

From a more orthodox Schenkerian perspective, Richard Kaplan (1985), in his dissertation on Strauss’s Elektra, refutes Proctor’s core principle of a “chromatic tonal system” in “nineteenth-
In his response to foreground and middleground chromatic complexes functioning within a chromatic background, Kaplan notes that “these [foreground and middleground] usages [of chromaticism] must be regarded as a means of expanding, rather than negating, [the diatonic tonal] system.”\(^{47}\) Kaplan’s conservative ideas on this subject are striking: amidst his study of Strauss’s highly chromatic opera, *Elektra* (whose status as tonal or atonal continues to be a perennial debate), he argues firmly for diatonic background structures as a rule in nineteenth-century music; his emphasis on this matter remains true to Schenker’s theory.\(^{48}\) What he also expresses in his research is the common goal of nineteenth-century composers to extend and expand the structurally diatonic practices of previous eras—hence, many Classical procedures continue to enter later styles.

In response to Patrick McCreless, Robert Morgan (1996), echoes many of Richard Kaplan’s ideas, stating that

> [t]here simply is no chromatic tonal system that is in any way analogous to the diatonic system…since a stable tonal practice presupposes a stable tonal system. This is not to dispute that in much twentieth-century music, and even in a few exceptional nineteenth-century compositions (the only ones I know being by Liszt), chromaticism reaches a point where both tonal centricity and triadic harmony give way, allowing a purely chromatic structure to emerge. But there is a much larger body of work, especially in the previous century, in which chromatic relationships, even if predominant, work in close interactions with diatonic ones (though the latter might be significantly “warped” under their influence). [...] The evolution of tonality in the nineteenth century thus did not give rise to an entirely new way of doing things, but to modifications and extensions of what was already being done.\(^{49}\)

Morgan’s views are conservatively Schenkerian in nature, and he does not limit himself only to ideas regarding diatonic background structures. In an earlier article on the music of Brahms, Schubert, Schumann, and Wagner, Morgan (1976) adapts Schenker’s theory to account for (1) dissonant

\(^{47}\) Kaplan, “The Musical Language of *Elektra*,” 82.

\(^{48}\) Kaplan’s comments predate McCreless’s essay, anticipating and remaining in dialogue with issues raised by McCreless in later years.

prolongations at deep structural levels and for (2) *Kopzfönen* supported by dissonant and non-tonic chords. He notes that while Schenker permits only a consonant background structure, the theory actually provides a model for analyzing music in which there are dissonant prolongations (often by voice-exchange) and the handling of non-coincidences that result in non-normative support for primary tones.\footnote{50} In sum, Morgan aims to illuminate the many ways in which nineteenth-century music behaves differently from music of earlier tonal styles while still adhering to Schenker’s theory of tonal analysis.\footnote{51}

### 2.3.4. Approaches to Phrase Expansion: Sarah Sarver and William Rothstein

In her research on Strauss’s music, Sarah Sarver (2010) investigates “embedded” and “parenthetical” chromaticism, depending on whether the chromaticism is “structurally integrated into the voice-leading fabric of the music” (embedded), or whether the chromaticism signals “a structural departure that challenges the coherence of the musical surface” (parenthetical, or interpolation).\footnote{52} Like Kaplan, Morgan, and, to some extent, Mitchell, Sarver emphasizes that while Strauss’s songs exhibit high levels of chromaticism, the diatonic background structure is not compromised. Furthermore, she writes:

> I find that the proposed notion of a chromatic system [like those proposed by Proctor, McCreless, and, to a certain extent, Mitchell] is antithetical to structural features [in Strauss’s music]. […] I am not compelled to commit Strauss’s compositional style to something that features structural properties that are simply tonal analogues. In other words, the extended chromatic techniques found [in many of Strauss’s works] are ones that are rooted in a tonal, diatonic background. In certain cases, though, surface-level digressions challenge the tonal coherence of late structural levels. Although these parenthetical regions create strong disturbances with events occurring close to the musical surface, the binding diatonic background does indeed remain intact.\footnote{53}

---


\footnote{51} Ibid., 58–59.


\footnote{53} Sarver, “Embedded and Parenthetical Chromaticism,” 8–9.
In sum, Sarver maintains a traditional approach to applying Schenker’s theory of harmony and voice-leading to her corpus of study.

While Sarver’s investigation of embedded and parenthetical chromaticism focuses mainly on voice-leading coherence, William Rothstein (1989) contends that these types of chromaticism frequently have formal consequences, too, by way of interpolated phrase expansions. Rothstein’s approach to this issue is similar to the one taken by Caplin, who, like Rothstein, cites Heinrich Christoph Koch’s (1793 [1983]) idea of “interpolation” as a guiding principle behind musical parentheses. Perhaps the main difference between Caplin and Rothstein is that Caplin is much more concerned with musical interpolations being motivically unrelated to the preceding formal function, whereas Rothstein suggests that many parenthetical passages are motivically related to a phrase’s formal functions, appearing often as chromatic passages that are prolongational. Caplin and Rothstein do agree, however, that reducing out the interpolated musical material should result in a normative model grouping structure (which is usually an eight-bar model).

2.3.5. My Adoption of a Diatonic Background Structure in Strauss’s Songs

As a conclusion to this survey of literature on *Formenlehre* and Schenkerian scholarship, I would like to make clear that the principles and analyses I present in my project align with those scholars listed above who argue for the retention of a strictly diatonic tonal system at the core of highly chromatic music. Like Brown, Dempster, and Headlam, I agree that the generative properties of Schenker’s theory make it immediately useful for the analysis of chromatic music. Similarly, like Kaplan and Morgan, I believe that chromaticism and dissonant prolongations at late structural levels extend a diatonic background structure rather than functioning within some kind of chromatic
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55 Please note, though, that Caplin’s approach—unlike Rothstein’s—is not Schenkerian in nature.
56 Caplin, *Classical Form*, 55.
system. Lastly, like Sarver and Rothstein, I account for chromatic passages nearer to the foreground and middleground as often being involved in a chromatic parenthesis, which, by way of formal and Schenkerian theories, serve as a decoration of underlying normative, tonal structures.

3. Methodology

Most simply, I espouse in this project a dual approach for investigating sentences and periods in Strauss’s songs. Like Schmalfeldt, my approach is Caplinian and Schenkerian in nature, pairing formal analyses with voice-leading sketches. I will discuss my methodology in the following sections, revealing my multivalent approach based on historical/biographical precedent, existing scholarly research, and elements common to specific my corpus of study.

3.1. Selection of the Corpus

I have limited my corpus of study for this project to Richard Strauss’s songs for voice and piano. In sifting through this literature, I have surveyed and analyzed all of his songs for voice and piano from each of his three compositional periods (early, middle, and late; 207 songs in total), and I have sought to pursue more detailed analyses of those songs that exhibit Classical harmonic and formal procedures. By so doing, I have chosen to leave for other scholars some of his most experimental songs that are commonly associated with his middle period and generally fall outside the boundaries of the Classical harmonic and formal paradigms that I aim to investigate. As you will see from my analyses, the composition dates and opus numbers of the songs I include are diverse; indeed, there are songs from each of Strauss’s compositional periods—even his middle period—that, at least to some extent, adhere to Classical harmonic and formal procedures.
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58 I have also limited my corpus by forgoing detailed analyses of Strauss’s songs that have been the focus of the (minimally) extant scholarship, such as the Brentano Lieder, Op. 68 (1918–1819). As a pianist who has performed many of Strauss’s songs, I confess to a slight personal bias toward Strauss’s songs for voice and piano (rather than the orchestral songs), and especially those that are rarely performed.
Conversely, I do not limit myself to songs that are “too Classical” in nature. Rather, I analyze chromatic songs that push the boundaries of (and continue to develop) my methodology, perhaps even to its breaking point, in addition to those that serve as baseline examples of Classical procedures in Strauss’s songs. The songs included in this study are meant to highlight the many paradigms of Classical harmonic and formal procedures that exist in the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth century, revealing especially how the effusiveness associated with the Romantic style shaped old procedures in new ways. In an effort to support the selection of my corpus, I return to Strauss’s biography and the development of his compositional process.

I began this chapter by summarizing Walter Werbeck’s account of Strauss’s compositional style and his indebtedness to the Classical era, particularly to the music of Mozart. In a similar vein, Wayne Heisler (2010) describes Strauss’s early education in composition, stating the following:

> [F]rom 1874 to 1882 Strauss pursued a general education at the Ludwigs-Gymnasium…and began taking instruction in music theory and composition with the conductor Friedrich Wilhelm Meyer in 1875. Meyer was an accomplished, if conservative, musician and Richard clearly benefited from the disciplined lessons—Gilliam has convincingly argued that Meyer’s conservatism is what led a traditionalist like Franz Strauss to entrust him with his son. […] Conventional wisdom holds that the first decade of Strauss’s endeavors as a composer was a period of filial loyalty, expressed through his devotion to his father’s beloved Austro-Germanic triumvirate: again, Haydn, Mozart, and Beethoven (but not late Beethoven!). As is evident in two of Strauss’s student compositions, the Piano Trio No. 1 in A (1877) and Piano Trio No. 2 in D (1878), his Classical allegiances served his evergrowing proficiency in *harmony*, *counterpoint*, *Classical form*, and writing for specific instruments. […] [In] the Trio No. 1 Strauss tackled the exposition with textbook faithfulness in terms of tonal-harmonic design and thematic contrast. […] If Strauss’s First Trio was steeped in the world of Haydn and Mozart, the Trio No. 2 in D of the following year suggests that early Beethoven was a model. The proportions are now larger: an example of what Sprecht identified as the youthful Strauss’s ‘eagerness to emulate the great masters’ and an ‘aptitude for assimilation’ in his early works.59

Here, Heisler points out details of Strauss’s biography not discussed by Werbeck, namely the influence of Franz Strauss’s musical/stylistic conservatism on the young Richard’s composition:
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endeavors. However, Heisler, like Werbeck, argues that Strauss’s education and immersion in the Classical style contributed to his compositional process in (at least) his early works—that is, works composed in the 1870s through the early 1880s.60

In the years 1882–1884, Strauss began to expand upon and break ties with the strict Classical norms that had remained evident in his music until that time. While the Classical style does not go entirely unrealized in his music during these years, normative theme-types become fuzzier and more greatly broadened: a hallmark of many Romantic-era compositions.61 Furthermore, just as Strauss relied upon and utilized conventions of the Classical era, he was also influenced by the music of his contemporaries. This point is made clear by Heisler, who states:

[T]hat Brahms, Liszt, and Wagner would overlap in Strauss’s music in the 1880s, and continue to do so in varying technical and aesthetic degrees, highlights what I have argued is Strauss’s most singular and enduring trait: his reliance on an array of composers and traditions.62

It is important to contextualize Heisler’s comment within his own research: he focuses here on Strauss’s early works as a way of setting up a preliminary argument and explanation for Strauss’s experimental middle-period works (such as Salome, Op. 54 (1905) and Elektra, Op. 58 (1909), among other vocal and instrumental works from the same time). In other words, Heisler’s conceit that Strauss’s early works exhibit many of the normative Classical formal structures need not be overshadowed by his comments on the adoption and adaptation of more contemporary styles. Similarly, we should not assume that the influence of the Classical style disappears from Strauss’s music after a handful of early pieces. In fact, recall from BaileyShea’s research that Strauss and many of his late-Romantic contemporaries—namely Wagner—integrated Classical theme-types through
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61 Heisler, “Maturity and Indecision, 48–49.
62 Ibid., 53.
the duration of their composition output. Surely, then, sentences and periods can (and do) arise in songs from all three of Strauss’s compositional periods.

Though I have limited my corpus of study to Richard Strauss’s songs for voice and piano, my observations and methods can also apply to his others works. It is evident in Strauss’s music that he also developed and integrated similar Classical harmonic and formal procedures in his operas and orchestral works. A case in point: James Hepokoski (2010) contrasts both the Classical impulses found in Strauss’s first cycle of tone poems, as described by David Larkin (2010), and those obfuscated in his second cycle of tone poems. Hepokoski notes that though Strauss’s compositional procedures—namely his harmonic language—changed significantly throughout his lifetime, he did not ever completely abandon the principles of the Classical style. In terms of Strauss’s operas, Bryan Gilliam (2010) points out that the stratification of styles in Der Rosenkavalier, Op. 59 (1910), pervades both Strauss’s music and his core principles as a Classically beholden composer: the opera showcases “the Viennese Classical style of the 1780s, the riper sounds of the 1860s and 1870s, and the chromatically enervated diatonicism of 1910.” In a separate but related study, Gilliam (1992) describes elements of tradition and innovation in Strauss’s Intermezzo, Op. 72 (1923), highlighting not only the opera’s tonal underpinnings but also its inclusion of sentential phrase structures, especially in the symphonic interlude waltz between Acts II and III. In sum, these scholars offer insight into the ways in which Strauss’s immersion and training in the Classical style is evident in his many compositional genres.

3.2. Overview: Organization of the Corpus by Theme-Type: Sentences and Periods

My methodology for defining sentences and periods in Strauss’s songs amalgamates approaches that I adopt from the scholars discussed earlier in this chapter, including BaileyShea, Callahan, Caplin, Richards, Rodgers, and Vande Moortele. At the center of these scholars’ methodologies is Caplin’s (1998) comprehensive study of Classical theme-types in the music of Haydn, Mozart, and Beethoven. Just as other scholars have adapted Caplin’s principles to fit their particular corpus of study, I too adapt Caplin’s principles—specifically for sentences and periods—for my study. In addition to Caplin’s theory, I also engage William Rothstein’s (1989) research on phrase rhythm (to which Caplin makes reference in Classical Form). The theories of these two scholars pair well with one another in expressing normative phrase lengths in Classical music. Like Caplin and Rothstein, I strive to reveal in my analyses a Classically paradigmatic underlying eight-bar phrase that governs passages laden with parenthetical musical material. As Rothstein and Sarver have pointed out, phrase expansion by way of parenthesis is not only common in the Classical era, but is still normative in the Romantic era. I also blend these theories of phrase structure with Carl Schachter’s (2016) Schenkerian approach to similar topics. The practicality of coupling formal analysis with Schenkerian analysis often reveals musical structures and features that cannot be fully accounted for by one or the other type of analysis alone. As I have already mentioned, this kind of approach responds directly to Schmalfeldt’s research, and it attends more closely to both melody and harmony and the beautiful—and sometimes surprising—ways they work together in Strauss’s songs. Where Strauss obfuscates normative Classical paradigms, he embeds the inherent unification

68 Caplin’s methodology is indebted to the work of Schonberg and Ratz.
of these formal structures in other ways, namely by way of voice leading and the melodic-motivic interplay between the voice and piano.

3.2.1. Sentences and Their Elaborations

In the crudest sense, I regard sentences in Strauss’s songs as exhibiting the standard proportions short : short : long. Of course these proportions leave much to the imagination, prompting questions about exactly how short a “short” unit must be or how much longer the “long” unit must be. My goal is to find a reasonable via media—one that is less prescriptive than claiming that all sentences in Strauss’s songs are exactly eight-bar units with no expansion, but more prescriptive than leaving completely undefined the crude proportions just mentioned. For example, BaileyShea finds that many passages in Wagner’s music “can be heard as expansions or distortions of conventional sentence proportions. In particular, the basic hyper-rhythmic gesture of the sentence, the proportion short—short—long, is often expanded with extra statements of the basic idea at different sequential levels.”\(^7\) In this case, BaileyShea identifies a couple of characteristic features of Wagnerian sentences that are important to my own methodology: first, and most importantly, they adhere to basic sentential proportions, underlying which is likely a 2-bar + 2-bar + 4-bar configuration, but with the possibility of expansions or contractions in any of those units; second, they often exhibit an extra statement of the basic idea which, obviously, distorts the conventional sentential organization. In all, BaileyShea uses his findings to situate Wagnerian sentences between Classical paradigms and innovative, post-Classical practices, broadening and reshaping what a sentence “is” in Wagner’s music.

As I have previously mentioned, BaileyShea is not the only scholar to codify sentences in non-Classical music; other scholars include Stephen Rodgers (2014 and 2017, on Schubert), Steven BaileyShea, “Wagner’s Loosely Knit Sentences,” 12 (BaileyShea’s emphasis).
Vande Moortele (2011, on Liszt), Matthew BaileyShea (2002, 2003, and 2004 on Wagner), Michael Callahan (2013, on The Great American Songbook), and Mark Richards (2015, on expanding the sentence paradigm in the Viennese Classical tradition; and 2016, on Film Music). My plan, then, is to follow these authors’ approach to sentential structure. For example, they have stretched the limits of Caplin’s definition of the Classical-model sentence in the following three ways: (1) by extending beyond Caplin’s sentence model to allow a greater range of possible underlying prolongational and harmonic progressions, most specifically in the presentation phrase; (2) by preferring analyses that give greater attention to aspects of melody than those provided by Caplin; and (3) thereby collectively loosening and changing the terminology attached to and associated with Caplin’s models. One shared goal among these scholars is to identify vestiges of sentence structures in music outside of the Classical era; similarly, I trace these vestiges and note how Strauss’s songs often transform traditional Classical-era formal paradigms.

For my corpus of study, I define two groups of sentential structures within the broader sentence theme-type group: those that span 8 or 16 bars (i.e. no phrase expansion) and those that do not (i.e. by way of phrase expansion). Of those that span 8 or 16 bars, there are three subtypes: the Classical-model sentence (or an enlarged version of it), the Classical-model sixteen-measure sentence, and the Straussian hybrid sentence (defined below). Of the sentences that do not span 8 or 16 bars, there are two subtypes: sentences with an expanded second idea (either a repetition of the basic idea or a contrasting idea) in the presentation phrase or sentences with an expanded

---

continuation phrase. Before addressing all of these sentence-types in more detail, I will say a brief word about the origin of the terminology I use in this project. Where possible, I maintain Caplin’s terminology—among its benefits is its familiarity, its regarded status as having been rigorously defined, and its general presence as a “baseline” in recent Formenlehre research. In some cases, however, I expand and modify his terminology to suit the songs of Richard Strauss. In all, I strive to maintain the Classical principles set forth by Caplin in a way that shows how Strauss’s songs are in dialogue with Classical practices rather than abandoning them altogether.

3.2.1.1. Sentences without Phrase Expansion: 8- and 16-Measure Models

3.2.1.1.1. The Classical-Model 8-Measure Sentence

The Classical-model sentence needs little to no introduction or explanation. According to Caplin’s theory

[t]he sentence is an eight-measure theme built out of two four-measure phrases. In this grouping structure, which Ratz indicates as (2 x 2) + 4, the theme expresses three formal functions—presentation, continuation, and cadential. The opening phrase contains the first of these functions and thus is termed a presentation phrase. The second phrase incorporates the remaining two functions.73

For Caplin, the presentation phrase of the Classical-model sentence comprises tonic prolongation by way of a 2-bar basic idea (b.i.) and its repetition; the continuation phrase comprises fragmentation of this idea, its liquidation, and a cadential progression, concluding with a definitive cadence.74

Though the Classical-model sentence comprises an 8-bar unit (2-bars + 2-bars + 4-bars), Caplin allows for its contraction or expansion to 4- and 16-bar units by way of the formula R = \( \frac{1}{2}N \) and R = 2N, respectively, where R indicates a “real,” perceived measure and N indicates a “notated” measure. To be sure, Caplin derives these formulas based on tempi;75 however, in Strauss’s songs,

---

73 Caplin, Classical Form, 35.
74 Ibid., 35–48.
75 Ibid., 35.
tempo has less to do with the equation than the actual span of sentence structures. In other words, sentences in Strauss’s songs—derived from Caplin’s Classical-model sentence—have less to do with “real” measures and more to do with the preservation of Classical sentence proportions; his songs generally exhibit sentences either in strict Classical proportions (2-bars + 2-bars + 4-bars) or in enlarged, doubled Classical proportions (4-bars + 4-bars + 8-bars), where the latter is merely an amplification of the Classical-model sentence (as it suits the effusiveness of the Romantic era).

Other than the possible expansion of a sentence in Strauss’s songs to a 4-bar + 4-bar + 8-bar unit, all other musical parameters associated with the Classical-model sentence remain.76

3.2.1.2. The Classical-Model 16-Measure Sentence

Caplin describes the Classical-model compound sentence (or 16-measure sentence) as consisting of

an eight-measure presentation followed by an eight-measure continuation. The presentation contains a compound basic idea and its immediate repetition, both supported by a tonic prolongational progression. The continuation is characterized by fragmentation, harmonic acceleration, sequential harmonies, or increased surface rhythm. The sixteen-measure sentence most often closes with a perfect authentic cadence; a concluding half cadence is rare.77

Notice that the Classical-model sixteen-measure sentence is different from an expanded Classical-model sentence: most importantly, the sixteen-measure sentence’s presentation comprises a compound basic idea (basic idea + contrasting idea; it does not close with a cadence) rather than a simple basic idea and its repetition, as seen in the Classical-model sentence. In this way, the enlarged Classical-model sentence and the Classical-model sixteen-measure may span the same number of measures and preserve the same underlying proportions; however, their respective presentation’s melodic-motivic content will be different by design.

76 For Caplin’s thorough discussion of the Classical-model sentence, see Ibid., 35–48.

77 Ibid., 69.
Since the contrasting idea (c.i.) is a distinguishing feature between model sentences and sixteen-measure sentences, it is necessary to define clearly its musical features and the ways in which it differs from a basic idea. Caplin describes a contrasting idea in the following way:

[The contrasting idea...achieves its ‘contrast’ with the basic idea most obviously by means of melodic-motivic content. In the clearest cases, the contrasting idea introduces motives distinctly different from those of the basic idea. A contrast between the two ideas...may also be achieved, or at least supported by secondary features such as texture, dynamics, and articulation. More significantly, however, the basic idea and contrasting idea differ with respect to their fundamental harmonic organization. The basic idea is usually supported by a tonic prolongational progression, and the contrasting idea must close with a cadential progression [in an antecedent and consequent phrase]. In cases in which the contrasting idea seems to resemble the basic idea because of shared motives, the different underlying harmonies distinguish one idea from the other.]

For Caplin, the contrasting idea has only to do with a few theme-types: sixteen-measure sentences, Hybrid 3s (b.i. + c.i. + continuation; addressed below), and periods (antecedent (b.i. + c.i.) + consequent (b.i. + modified c.i.); also addressed below). The introduction of new melodic material into either the presentation phrase of a sentence and sentence-like structures (such as Hybrid 3), or the antecedent phrase of a period, allows for a greater variety of melodic-motivic material that can later be developed. For Strauss, the contrasting idea is an important part of sentence-like structures in his songs.

3.2.1.3. The Straussian Hybrid 8- or 16-Measure Sentence

The Straussian Hybrid Sentence (hybrid sentence, hereafter) is a new kind of sentence-like structure that I define for the songs of Richard Strauss. Most simply, the hybrid sentence is based on Caplin’s Classical-model Hybrid 3 (with some exceptions), which he describes as compound basic idea (b.i. + c.i.) + continuation. Caplin’s Classical-model sentence and Hybrid 3 differ in one way: a “true” sentence’s presentation phrase comprises a basic idea and its repetition, but a Hybrid 3’s

---

78 Ibid., 49 (Caplin’s emphasis).
79 Ibid., 61.
“presentation” phrase comprises a compound basic idea. To be sure, Strauss favors the basic idea +
contrasting idea design in his songs; in fact, this is the most common, most “normative”
configuration of the initiating unit in Strauss’s sentential structures. With respect to the melodic-
motivic and harmonic-prolongational aspects of the Hybrid 3 design, Caplin offers the following
commentary: “[b]y virtue of its melodic-motivic content, a compound basic idea resembles an
antecedent. In light of its underlying harmony, which is usually (but not always) tonic prolongational,
a compound basic idea resembles a presentation.”80 Caplin also adds to this description that, in the
case of an antecedent phrase, the compound basic idea must end with a weak cadence—that is,
weaker than the cadence that marks the conclusion of the following consequent phrase.81 Therefore,
for the purposes of my research and this dissertation, I adopt Caplin’s notion of a compound basic
idea “resembl[ing] a presentation” phrase when it does not end with a cadence. Furthermore, with
specific respect to a Hybrid 3 design (or any analog thereof), I regard the compound basic idea as a
“presentation”—labeling, as shown, the word “presentation” in quotation marks in order to
acknowledge presentation function, though it does not exactly match Caplin’s strict definition and
description of a “true” presentation phrase.

Strauss’s modifications of the Classical sentence are likely the result of his Romantic
sensitivities and flare for musical drama.82 According to BaileyShea, the inherent dramatic and
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80 Ibid., 61.
81 Ibid., 49–53.
82 In a Spring 2016 seminar on Classical form, Mark Richards referred colloquially to Caplin’s Hybrid 3 as a “hybrid
sentence.” I borrow this terminology from him and apply it in this study to the music of Richard Strauss. Furthermore,
Caplin, himself, notes that Hybrid 3 is very much like a sentence but with a contrasting idea replacing the repetition of
the basic idea (Caplin, Classical Form, 63). My definition of Straussian Hybrid Sentences differs a bit from Caplin’s Hybrid
3; therefore, rather than adopting Caplin’s terminology, I suggest this closely related term to show both the similarities
and differences the Straussian Hybrid Sentence has with a Classical-model Hybrid 3. Furthermore, I propose the term
“Straussian Hybrid Sentence” as a preliminary label for Hybrid 3-like structures in his music. I admit that I have not yet
conducted a comprehensive survey of whether or not this term (or a simpler term, such as Mark Richards’s “hybrid
sentence”) would fit similar formal structures in the music of Strauss’s contemporaries. However, I use “Straussian
Hybrid Sentence” to highlight Strauss’s affinity for Hybrid 3-like models, therefore crediting him and his music for
formal and structural similarities according to this model in his songs. It may well be that Strauss’s contemporaries
compose similar formal structures in their songs; however, without a thorough investigation of their music, I reserve this
label for Strauss’s songs for voice and piano.
expressive potential of sentence-like structures is truly incredible and something that was harnessed by Romantic composers: potential energy builds in the presentation phrase as basic and contrasting ideas work together to point toward a cadence (even if denied), releasing kinetic energy in the continuation phrase. For Caplin, there are similar rhetorical motivations for “breaking the norms” in the Classical era, too. He notes that

we might inquire why hybrid themes appear regularly throughout classical compositions. An obvious answer, of course, is that they offer more options beyond the sentence or period for shaping a logically satisfying theme. But they also offer something more: the latent ambiguity of a hybrid—is it more like a sentence or more like a period?—renders it especially suitable for assimilating itself to a higher-level unit of a more conventional thematic design[.]

Not only do these “higher-level units” often translate to Caplin’s compound theme-types, such as the sixteen-measure sentence or the sixteen-measure period, but they also participate in a heightened sense of musical expectation: sentential proportions remain, but melodic-motivic characteristics become increasingly unpredictable.

With this in mind, I return now to a more detailed description of the Straussian Hybrid Sentence. First, like Classical-model Hybrid 3s, hybrid sentences exhibit a basic idea + contrasting idea + continuation configuration. However, rather than adhering strictly to a 2-bar + 2-bar + 4-bar configuration, they may also exhibit a 4-bar + 4-bar + 8-bar configuration, generating spans of either 8 or 16 measures. Like model sentences and sixteen-measure sentences, hybrid sentences—in their normative configuration—do not contain phrase expansions or alterations to the governing sentence proportions. Furthermore, each of the three expected formal functions—presentation, continuation, and cadential, in that order—must be present. Table 1.1 provides an overview of these three sentence forms and their possible enlarged versions in Strauss’s songs, all of which, as mentioned above, derive from Caplin’s theory. Second, rather than the presentation phrase
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84 Caplin, Classical Form, 63.
85 Ibid., 35.
exhibiting only strict tonic prolongation (like Hybrid 3s), hybrid sentences may instead exhibit tonic Stufe prolongation. This point is particularly important for making sense of Strauss’s Romantic, chromatic harmonic language and his preference for a harmonically transitory musical surface. In fact, it is certainly uncommon to find strict tonic prolongation in Strauss’s presentation phrases; rather, Strauss often integrates colorful, chromatic, non-Classical progressions in order to prolong the tonic Stufe. Third, hybrid sentences possess in their continuation phrase a fragmentation of motivic ideas developed first by the basic idea in the presentation phrase. Fourth, and lastly, hybrid sentences possess strong cadential function, concluding with an authentic or half cadence, which may or may not be in the same key as the beginning of the sentence.

Table 1.1. Model Sentence, Model Sixteen-Measure Sentence, Straussian Hybrid Sentence, and their Possible Enlarged Versions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model Sentence</th>
<th>Straussian Hybrid Sentence (like Caplin’s Hybrid 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2-bar b.i. + 2-bar b.i. + 4-bar cont.</td>
<td>2-bar b.i. + 2-bar c.i. + 4-bar cont.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enlarged Model Sentence</td>
<td>Model Sixteen-Measure Sentence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-bar b.i. + 4-bar b.i. + 8-bar cont.</td>
<td>4-bar c.b.i. + 4-bar c.b.i. + 8-bar cont.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enlarged Straussian Hybrid Sentence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4-bar b.i. + 4-bar c.i. + 8-bar cont.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2.1.2. Sentences with Phrase Expansion: Expanded Versions of Model and Hybrid Sentences

With the formal features and rhetorical qualities of model and hybrid sentences in mind, I address the possibility of expanded versions of these types of sentences. To be sure, a sentence is “expanded” if it spans beyond a normative 8- or 16-measure model—that is, some kind of phrase expansion is present. An expanded sentence should not be confused with an enlarged sentence, which is simply the multiplication of a model unit by two (i.e. the enlarged Classical-model sentence.

---

86 In the case of a sentence ending with a half cadence, there is the possibility that the identified sentence is participating in a larger structure, like the antecedent of a period design.
is a sixteen-measure unit whose presentation and continuation phrases have been doubled in length, from four measures to eight measures). Similarly, an expanded sentence should not be confused with a compound sentence, whose configuration is clearly defined by Caplin in terms of melodic-motivic and harmonic content, in addition to the expected number of measures that the theme-type spans. If, then, a theme-type presents an expanded profile, I include the adjective “expanded” in its label. This procedure not only allows me to identify more specifically the type of sentence that I analyze, but it also implies something of the musico-rhetorical effect of expanded formal structures and the many ways in which they often participate in a heightened sense of musical story-telling. Therefore, compared to 8- and 16-measure models, expanded sentences evoke a greater sense of musical drama through deformations of paradigmatic formal organizations.

To be sure, expanded sentences have as their foundation Classical-model, compound, or hybrid features, such as a presentation phrase of b.i. + b.i., a hybrid “presentation” phrase of b.i. + c.i., or a compound presentation phrase of c.b.i. + c.b.i. In general, they often exhibit the following features. First, and preliminarily, they simply do not adhere to normative 8- or 16-measure models—that is, expanded sentences feature some kind of added musical material that expands their overall length. Second, expanded sentences may not adhere to strict sentence proportions (i.e. they do not have at their core a 1:1:2 ratio), or they may not exhibit all three formal functions of a sentence. Either the presentation or the continuation may be expanded. In the case of an expanded “presentation” phrase (i.e. b.i. + c.i. configuration), the contrasting idea is most commonly the expanded unit. In the case of an expanded continuation phrase, the continuation may be expanded (1) by way of effusive fragmentation of one or none of the presentation’s ideas; (2) by way of anti-fragmentation, in which references to the presentation’s ideas are greatly expanded, slowing—rather than accelerating—the continuation’s progression toward the cadence; or (3) by way of cadential function following immediately after the presentation—that is, the qualities of fragmentation and
liquidation may be entirely omitted. Third, due to particular reasons for phrase expansion, expanded sentences may exhibit more harmonic diversity in their presentation phrase than either tonic or tonic Stufe prolongation. In some instances, the harmonic motion may point strongly toward a non-tonic key area at the end of the presentation phrase, perhaps even by employing a cadence of limited scope. Fourth, and finally, expanded sentences, like hybrid sentences, exhibit definitive cadential function by way of an authentic or half cadence, but not necessarily in the key in which the sentence began.

While there are a number of different ways in which Strauss loosens the sentence paradigm, there are two ways that are more common than others. The first and most common way is by expanding a continuation phrase by one or (usually) many more measures beyond its normative span. These expansions often begin in the third measure of the continuation phrase, allowing the listener to trace for a brief moment what at first appears to be a normative beginning of the continuation phrase, only to have their expectations thwarted by a significant ballooning out of musical material. This effusiveness is not just a hallmark of Strauss’s expanded sentences but a style marker of the Romantic era in general. The second way Strauss loosens the sentence paradigm has an opposite rhetorical effect from the greatly expanded continuation; rather, Strauss often begins a hybrid sentence with a normative 2-bar basic idea but then expands the contrasting idea beyond 2 bars, disrupting the proportions of the “presentation” phrase. Most often the contrasting idea also interrupts tonic or tonic Stufe prolongation, diverging from the basic idea and distorting its rhetorical markers. The following continuation phrase of such hybrid sentences may feature either a similar expansion to complement the enlarged contrasting idea, or it may be greatly reduced in duration as a
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87 Caplin describes the “cadence of limited scope” in terms of an apparent cadence that arrives “too early” (often at the end of a basic idea) to dictate harmonic closure. Rather, this “cadence” participates in local formal closure of a particular formal unit within a theme type. See William E. Caplin, “The Classical Cadence: Conceptions and Misconceptions,” *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 57, no. 1 (2004): 51–117.
way of compensating for the expansion in the “presentation.” While these are only two of the many possibilities by which Strauss loosens the sentence paradigm, they are certainly the most prominent two.

3.2.2. Periods and Their Elaborations

3.2.2.1. The Straussian Hybrid Period

A second theme-type found in Strauss’s songs, but to a much lesser extent than sentences, is the period. The abundance of sentences and the lack of periods in Strauss’s songs contrasts Caplin’s remark that the eight-measure period is the most common tight-knit theme-type in instrumental music of the Classical era. While comparing vocal and instrumental music is in some ways like comparing apples and oranges, many of the cited scholars in this chapter have shown that Classical theme-types abound in normative and expanded forms in Romantic-era texted music. Overall, with respect to the Classical model, Strauss’s periods exhibit a relatively typical structure in—at least—their antecedent phrase. Caplin describes the Classical-model antecedent phrase as beginning with a 2-bar basic idea, followed by a 2-bar contrasting idea, which leads to a weak cadence. Strauss’s antecedent phrases generally follow this plan, but they often begin to defy Classical models in the consequent phrase (if one exists). For Caplin, a consequent phrase begins as a repetition of the antecedent phrase, though the repetition of the contrasting idea in the consequent is harmonically and melodically altered in order to generate a strong cadence at the close of the complete theme-type.

Strauss’s songs generally exhibit two possible formal outcomes after an antecedent phrase. The first possibility is a dissolving consequent phrase. In these cases, a parallel consequent phrase

88 Caplin, *Classical Form*, 49.
89 Ibid., 49.
90 Ibid., 49.
begins but it is submitted to some kind of deformation; therefore, the expected form dissolves into something other than a true consequent phrase. I borrow the idea of the “dissolving consequent phrase” from James Hepokoski and Warren Darcy (2006), who, discussing deformations in period structures, state that “it sometimes happens that a complete period…is sounded only to have the beginning of its second portion—[the consequent]—resounded (as if a full restatement is to be expected) but then subjected to dissolution.” Most often in Strauss’s songs, the consequent phrase dissolves into either a sentence, a continuation phrase, or a cadential unit that ends with a stronger cadence than the antecedent. In the case of a consequent phrase dissolving into or being replaced by a continuation phrase or cadential unit, one’s retrospective analysis reveals that what may have appeared to have been the consequent phrase was really in dialogue with Caplin’s Hybrid 1 or Hybrid 2. As for the overall structure of these phrase pairings, I use the term Straussian Hybrid Period (hybrid period, hereafter), though they may closely resemble Caplin’s Hybrid 1 and Hybrid 2. Specifically, hybrid periods generally take the following shape: antecedent + hybrid consequent (which could be a sentence, a continuation, or a cadential unit). I choose to offer this new label—just as I similarly offered the label “hybrid sentence”—in order to distinguish that, while these formal structures may appear to be replicas of, or in close dialogue with, Classical hybrid structures, Strauss’s harmonic language and general formal effusiveness is best accounted for by a distinct label for his style. In sum, notice that hybrid periods have the potential to greatly distort the symmetry
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92 Caplin describes Hybrid 1 as antecedent + continuation (or, colloquially, the “periodic sentence,” according to Mark Richards) and Hybrid 2 as antecedent + cadential (or, colloquially, the “cadential period,” according to Mark Richards). See Caplin, *Classical Form*, 59–63.
93 For similar reasons to my proposition of the label “Straussian Hybrid Sentence,” the label “Straussian Hybrid Period” encompasses what I observe to be normative for Strauss’s demonstrations of period-like structures. I reiterate that without a comprehensive survey of music by Strauss’s contemporaries, I cannot claim at this time that the “Straussian Hybrid Period” is formally and structurally similar to period-like models among other Romantic and late-Romantic composers. However, like the “Straussian Hybrid Sentence,” the “Straussian Hybrid Period” grants to Strauss and his music a sense of composer-specific formal regularity, and an investigation of similar formal structures among other composers may help classify and typify period-like structures in the Romantic and late-Romantic eras more definitively.
of a strict period—that is, the antecedent phrase (4 measures total) is often much shorter than the second half of the structure. In this way, their rhetorical significance is similar to that of expanded sentences.

3.2.2.2. The Lone Antecedent Phrase

The second possible formal outcome of an anticipated periodic design is the absence of a consequent phrase, leaving what I call the Lone Antecedent Phrase (lone antecedent, hereafter). In these cases, I cannot speak of a true period structure because, by definition, the antecedent has no formal partner, nor does the inherent open-endedness of antecedent phrase find either melodic-motivic, harmonic, or rhetorical closure. Furthermore, as I discussed above, true periodic structure, according to Caplin, involves a parallel consequent phrase—that is, one which must begin with a restatement of the antecedent’s basic idea in order to create the impression of having begun again a phrase whose goal is to seek the closure not fully generated by the antecedent.

Lone antecedent phrases invite a philosophical question about whether or not we can or should expect a consequent phrase to follow an apparent antecedent phrase in Romantic music (or music of any era, for that matter). This is a question to which I will return in my analyses of hybrid periods and lone antecedent phrases in Strauss’s songs (Chapter 3); however, as Caplin has pointed out in Classical music, “although the pair antecedent/consequent creates a logical succession, the two functions need not be linked together in all formal situations, and their mutual presence is not a necessary condition for their individual expression.” In all, such deformations of strict Classical models comprise a great deal of formal structures in Strauss’s songs.

In the following chapters, I will investigate the appearances of the theme-types listed above through a number of excerpts and full-song analyses. We will see together how sentential (especially)

94 Caplin, *Classical Form*, 59.
and periodic structures abound in Strauss’s music, revealing his admiration for the Classical era and its musical traditions.
CHAPTER 2
SENTENCES AND THEIR ELABORATIONS


“Befreit” (“Freed”), Op. 39, No. 4 (1898), is constructed as a three-stanza song whose stanzas divide into two distinct sections. Each of these two sections is set as a sentence or an elaboration thereof. As per the song’s modified strophic form, similarities in melodic-motivic content exist among each stanza and the two subsequent sections.1 The first section of the first stanza (Figure 2.1) comprises an 8-measure sentence whose configuration fits within the parameters of a Classical-model sentence: 2-bar b.i. (mm. 2–3) + 2-bar repetition of b.i. (mm. 4–5) + 4-bar continuation with two 1-bar fragments leading to a perfect authentic cadence in the major tonic (mm. 6–9).

In terms of the harmonic plan for this sentence, each statement of the basic idea exhibits the progression I–#III#4, which serves to prolong the tonic in the presentation phrase. Each time the basic idea is stated, a B♯4 is supported in the melody by the underlying #III#4. This B♯—which may at first appear to be a neighbor tone to B (m. 3, and placed in parentheses for this reason)—is really a passing tone—though not fully realized at first—between B♯4 (m. 2) to C♯5 (m. 6). In other words, B♯4 in m. 3 is simply an incomplete statement of the melodically fluent rising major second from B♯4 to C♯5; therefore, the B♯ in m. 3 is analogous to the B♯ in m. 5, where—in the repetition of the basic idea—the B♯ ultimately progresses to the middleground neighbor-tone C♯ in m. 6 (Figure 2.2). This linear connection from B♯ to C♯ is significant for at least two reasons: first, it fuses the end of the presentation phrase with the beginning of the continuation phrase (note also the role of the
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1 See Chapter 4, Figures 4.5 and 4.6, and Table 4.1, for a detailed analysis of the entire song (pp. 145, 153, and 142, respectively).
Figure 2.1. “Befreit,” Op. 39, No. 4, mm. 1–9; Form Overlay.
underlying harmony in accomplishing this fusion); second, the incomplete status of B# (m. 3) resolving immediately to C# highlights how the formal design of the sentence’s presentation phrase (basic idea plus its repetition) challenges one’s analysis of the apparent surface-level voice leading. As we see here, the apparent neighbor-tone figure (B#—B#—B#, mm. 2–4) is really a foreground apparition whose greater context at the middleground level is revealed when considering the basic idea and its repetition as a single voice-leading unit and a chromatic stepwise connection from B# to C#.

In addition to the prominence of the B#s in the basic idea and its repetition, the downward arpeggio by major third from B#4 to G#4 (m. 3) is also characteristic of the presentation phrase. In the first statement of the basic idea (m. 3), G# arises as a simple downward arpeggiation from B#; as an elaboration of this gesture in the repetition of the basic idea (m. 5), G# arises by a descending, stepwise filling-in of the B#–G# arpeggio. This melodic-motivic descending major third (as a simple arpeggio or filled in by step) is recalled in the continuation phrase’s fragmentation (mm. 6–7).
As is characteristic of continuation phrases in Classical-model sentences, the continuation phrase in this passage from “Befreit” comprises 1-bar fragmentations of melodic-motivic material derived from the basic idea, followed by its eventual liquidation. The melodic-motivic major third from the presentation phrase, which serves as the fragmented melodic-motivic unit, can be visualized more easily in my voice-leading sketch (refer again to Figure 2.2). Note in this sketch that the initial descending major third is labeled “x”; the restatement and subsequent transformations are shown as references to “x.” Just as the downward arpeggio from B# to G# in the basic idea and its repetition was first presented as a simple unfilled arpeggiation and then filled in with a passing tone, so too does the downward unfilled arpeggiation of a major third from E5 to C5 (m. 6) and the downward filled-in arpeggiation of a minor third from E5 (which is rectified from E# as the #IV seventh predominant progresses toward the cadential dominant) to C5 (m. 7) engage a similar melodic-motivic profile, derived from the basic idea. As another homage to the basic idea—specifically the first iteration of the basic idea—the neighbor-tone-like B#4 (which is ultimately understood as a passing tone) is recalled among the 1-bar fragments: here, the B4 established in the voice in m. 2 rises to the neighbor tone C#5, which is prolonged in mm. 6 and 7 by upper-third decorations (addressed above), and eventually falls back to B4 in m. 8. Whereas B#4 may have first appeared as a neighbor tone on the music’s surface (m. 3), the C#5 in mm. 6–7 functions as a definitive complete neighbor tone to B4.

Finally, these motivic gestures—neighbor and passing tones—are consolidated and liquidated in m. 8 as the sentence draws near to its cadence. Three references to filled and unfilled descending-third arpeggios are evident in this measure: B#4 to G#4 (unfilled, as an unfolding), C#5
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2 The rectification of E# to E is also in dialogue with the rectification of B# to B over the course of the sentence, which prevents the harmonic trajectory of the sentence from becoming too far removed from E as tonic.
to A♯4 (filled, as an upper-third embellishment of A♮), and A♯4 to F♯4 (filled, as a second unfolding, which pairs with B♭ to G♯). Overall, though this sentence is a bit more harmonically colorful than most Classical-model sentences, it resembles closely the Classical paradigm in its fulfillment of melodic-motivic and harmonic obligations. In fact, this sentence is quite tightly knit in terms of these parameters, especially when noting Strauss’s proclivity for elaborating the Classical-model sentence in his songs.

In the case of “Befreit,” the poetic structure and rhyme scheme of the first half of the first stanza (in black font below) does not lend itself too intuitively to the proportions and design of a textual representation of a musical sentence (which is better exhibited by a limerick, for example).

**Befreit**  
*Richard Dehmel*

Du wirst nicht weinen. Leise, leise  
wirst du lächeln: und wie zur Reise  
geb’ ich dir Blick und Kuß zurück.  
Unsre lieben vier Wände! Du hast sie  
bereitet, ich habe sie dir zur Welt geweitet --  
O Glück!

**Freed**

You will not weep. Gently, gently  
you will smile; and as before a journey,  
I shall return your gaze and kiss.  
Our dear four walls you have helped  
build; and I have now widened them for you  
into the world.  
O joy!

The three lines of poetry that comprise this passage exhibit a single rhyming couplet, linking the words “leise” and “Reise” at the end of lines 1 and 2; however, the rhyme scheme cannot be granted too much status in terms of directing structural events in the music, since both of the rhyming words are involved in an enjambment and spill over to the subsequent line. The enjambment renders the poetry as quite continuous in nature. Rather than using the rhyming couplet to mark the end of a form-functional musical unit, Strauss magnifies the poetry’s structural continuity by burying the word “Reise” in the middle of the continuation phrase (m. 7). The resulting text-music

---

3 Translation mine.
relationship emphasizes the sentence’s inherent rhetorical effect, which, as stated in Chapter 1, is described by Matthew BaileyShea as potential energy in the presentation phrase released as kinetic energy in the continuation phrase, or what Stephen Rodgers has referred to colloquially as the “ready, set, go! effect.”

In particular, the rhyme scheme of this passage pairs lines 1 and 2, but leaves the word “zurück” at the end of line 3 without an immediate rhyming partner. Notice, however, that in the remainder of the first stanza (in gray font above) the last three lines of the poem form a similar rhyme scheme as the first three: lines 4 and 5 rhyme, and the final line (“o Glück!”) is the rhyming partner of the earlier “zurück.” As we will see in following analyses, Strauss most often sets four lines of poetry to sentential structures, much like Rodgers shows in his analyses of Schubert’s songs; Strauss’s setting of three lines of poetry here is a rare occurrence.

However, the text-setting benefit of using a three-line unit like the one in “Befreit” is that it eliminates the possibility of rhyming couplets among four-line units that often distort sentence structure. For example, consider the following four-line stanza below which Strauss sets as a sixteen-measure sentence in the song “Ich trage meine Minne” (I Bear My Love for You”), Op. 32, No. 1.

Ich trage meine Minne
Karl Henckell

Ich trage meine Minne vor Wonne
stumm
im Herzen und im Sinne mit mir herum
Ja, dass ich dich gefunden, du liebes
Kind,
das freut mich alle Tage, die mir
beschrieben sind.

I bear my love for you with wonder and
silence
in my heart and in my soul,
yes: that I have found you, my darling,
fills me with joy every day that is granted
to me.

---

5 Rodgers referred to the “ready, set, go! effect” in a talk at Florida State University on January 25, 2019, where he emphasized the propulsion and forward-moving nature of the sentence paradigm.
6 See Figures 2.7 and 2.8 (pp. 58 and 60, respectively) for a detailed analysis of this stanza from “Ich trage meine Minne.”
Notice in this stanza that end of lines 1 and 2 rhyme (“stumm” and “herum”), as do lines 3 and 4 (“Kind” and “sind”). In terms of estimating sentential proportions, if lines 1 and 2 are set as basic idea and its repetition (or, in the case of “Ich trage meine Minne,” a compound basic idea and its repetition), the poem’s rhyme scheme suits well the overall structure of a sentence’s presentation phrase: basic idea plus its repetition, corresponding with a pair of rhyming words). However, the rhyme scheme of lines 3 and 4—comprising the continuation phrase—poses the distinct possibility of a division based on rhyming words in the middle of the continuation phrase, which would distort sentential proportions. In other words, if the two-part division of the presentation phrase is achieved by pairing lines 1 and 2, the continuation phrase could similarly be divided by lines 3 and 4.

According to the parameters of the sentence paradigm, the continuation phrase should be—per its name—continuous in nature, exhibiting an uninterrupted musical unit in which motives are fragmented and liquidated as the sentence progresses towards and achieves its cadence. We will see in later analyses of “Ich trage meine Minne” and other songs how Strauss compensates for the inherent disruptions of sentential proportions due to rhyme scheme (especially in the continuation phrase); in many cases, he integrates melodic-motivic fragments in the piano accompaniment to smooth over divisions between the third and fourth lines of the poetry, which maintains the goal-directed forward motion of the continuation phrase.


Like the first two lines of “Befreit,” Strauss makes use of an opening rhyming couplet (“runden” and “gesunden”) in “Mohnblumen” (“Poppies”), Op. 22, No. 2 (1886–1888). However, unlike “Befreit,” the poem proceeds differently thereafter in terms of its rhyme scheme over six lines of poetry. Each set of two lines forms a rhyming couplet, which does not naturally lend itself to sentential proportions.
As BaileyShea has pointed out, the closest poetic analog to a musical sentence is a limerick, which comprises an opening rhyming couplet (lines 1 and 2) plus three more lines of poetry in which only the last line (line 5) rhymes with the opening rhyming couplet. As mentioned above, in the case of “Mohnblumen,” the first stanza is six lines in length—expressing three pairs of rhyming couplets (lines 1 & 2, 3 & 4, and 5 & 6)—which does not inherently exhibit sentential proportions by way of rhyme scheme and poetic structure. To be sure, though, Strauss sets this stanza as an expanded sentence, with compositional compensation for its rather square, yet non-sententially-proportional design. Strauss’s musical manifestation of this stanza comprises ten measures (mm. 3–12) with the organization of basic idea (mm. 3–4), its repetition (mm. 5–6), and a six-bar continuation (mm. 7–12, Figure 2.3). The six-bar continuation phrase expands strict sentential proportions; however, the “extra” two measures in the continuation phrase are the result of the “extra” rhyming words in line 5 of the poem. As you will see in Figure 2.3, I have placed phrase counts within the piano staves, indicating that mm. 9 and 10 function as parenthetical elaborations (as per the poem’s structure) that expand the continuation phrase while preserving one-bar rhyming fragments.

These two parenthetical measures pair with the text. Notice that line 5 of the poem (which corresponds with mm. 9–10) is structured differently from lines 1–4 and 6; rather than line 5 exhibiting a complete thought, the line offers only two single-word adjectives that further

---

8 Translation mine.
Figure 2.3. “Mohnblumen,” Op. 22, No. 2, mm. 1–12; Form Overlay.
characterize the poppies. Simply, these words are poetically and descriptively supplementary to the story told in the poem. The shift in the poetry from complete thoughts to single-word adjectives also corresponds with the underlying harmony in mm. 7–10. First, the harmonic profile of mm. 7–8 is exactly the same as m. 1 of the song—a curious auxiliary progression that suggests having begun in medias res. Second, there is also a voice-leading strand that we can trace from mm. 1–2 to 7–8.

Notice in mm. 1–2 that C⁵ and C⁶, supported by the two predominant chords in m. 1 (beat 3), are pressed downward to C₃ (literally into the bass) in m. 2 (Figure 2.4). However, when this progression is repeated in mm. 7–8, C# ascends to D, which is prolonged through mm. 9–10.

---

9 Strauss’s affinity for beginning songs with auxiliary progressions is a characteristic of many of his songs that we will see in this and later analyses. In most cases, these auxiliary openings paint an aspect of the first line of the poetry, specifically the way in which the poem’s story often seemingly begins midstream. For “Mohnblumen,” the poetry gives the sense of having begun in the middle of the speaker’s depiction of red poppies. As a brief aside, this song is the second in a set of four “Mädchenblumen Lieder” (“Maiden Flower Songs”) in which the speaker describes “Kornblumen” (“Cornflowers”), “Epheu” (“Ivy”), and “Wasserrose” (“Water Lily”). Particularly in “Kornblumen,” “Mohnblumen,” and “Epheu,” the speaker begins their description of the flowers as if walking through a lush garden, pointing out and describing the flowers whenever they see a new one. In other words, these three poems in particular take on a beginning-in-the-middle character, which—especially in the case of “Mohnblumen”—is compositionally complemented by the opening auxiliary progression.
There is a beautiful interaction, then, between structure and design, music and poetry that is illuminated by the comparison of these measures. The harmonic progression that was once auxiliary at the beginning of the song (mm. 1–4) is reinterpreted as part of a cadential progression in mm. 7–12—a necessary constituent of a continuation phrase. Furthermore, while mm. 9–10 serve a poetically prolongational role—by which I mean they support the description of the poppies as single-word adjectives rather than as complete thoughts—they also provide a prolongational role from a voice-leading perspective. In these measures, the D5 to which the C#5 in mm. 7–8 finally ascends, after having been pushed downward to Cn3 in mm. 1–2, is prolonged through mm. 9–10 and re-achieved by the progression B4–C#5–D5 through mm. 11–12. This ascending third from B4 to D5 facilitates an unrealized journey for the C#5 that ultimately ascends to D5 in these final measures. Furthermore, the chromatic voice exchange between F#4/D5 and D#3/F#5 in mm. 10–11 not only clarifies the single-word, adjectival poetic structure in line 5 of the poem, but it also aids in directing the forward progression of the continuation phrase. With respect to the poetry, then, the revelatory information about the poppies is finally revealed in the last line of the poem: “tanznimmermüden Seelen”/“their souls never tired of dancing”—that is, as C#5 achieves its
expected resolution to D5 near to the end of this passage, so too does the description of the poppies culminate in their characterization of never being too tired to dance.

To conclude my discussion of “Mohnblumen,” I would like to relate the auxiliary nature of mm. 1–6 to the meaning and structure of the poetry, noting especially how these two poetic parameters inform my reading of the underlying harmonic progression. First, and foremost, it is appropriate to regard the auxiliary progressions in mm. 1–6 as “resolutions” to tonic rather than “cadences” on tonic in mm. 4 and 6. Second, the progression II–V–I in these measures captures not only the parallel construction—if not auxiliary nature—of the basic idea and its repetition, but it also relates to the descriptiveness of lines 1 and 2 of the poetry. Specifically, the description of the poppies in lines 1 and 2 becomes clearer and more focused in lines 3, 4, and 6 of the poem. In other words, the “round, red-blooming, healthy” poppies to which the poem references in lines 1 and 2 become characterized and described more completely in lines 3, 4, and 6 as “bloom[ing] and bak[ing] in the summer,” “in a cheery mood,” and “never tired of dancing.” Because of the organization of the poetry and the nature of the underlying harmonic progression, these measures reveal how harmonic underpinnings relate to poetic meaning, specifically how the auxiliary progression at the beginning of the song and the corresponding adjectival description of the poppies point toward the fulfillment of a complete cadential progression in the stanza’s final measures and the culmination of the poppies’ characterization.


In the two songs that we have examined so far (“Befreit” and “Mohnblumen”), both exhibit many features of Classical-model sentences, specifically unambiguous tonal frameworks, characteristic harmonic prolongations and cadential progressions, and identifiable fragmentation in their continuation phrases as one-half the length of the basic idea. Unlike “Befreit” and “Mohnblumen,” however, “Leises Lied” (“Quiet Song”), Op. 39, No. 1 (1898), does not
immediately convey harmonic and tonal clarity, nor does it possess the characteristic Classical fragmentation in its continuation phrase—in fact, it arguably does not fragment at all. However, even though a number of important features of the Classical-model sentence paradigm are missing in this song, it still exhibits a sentential structure based on its melodic-motivic and voice-leading content. Specifically, the song exhibits expanded sentence structure.

Like “Befreit” and “Mohnblumen,” Strauss sets the first stanza of “Leises Lied” as a sentence, though subsequent stanzas are not set sententially. The sentence comprises a 9-bar unit (mm. 2–10) in the following configuration: basic idea (mm. 2–3) + basic idea (mm. 4–6) + continuation (mm. 7–10, Figure 2.5). The 8-bar model is expanded by one measure as the result of a one-beat displacement of the repetition of the basic idea (mm. 4–6; note the phrase counts in the middle of the piano grand staff). Though the presentation phrase is expanded by one measure, its pitch content remains nearly perfectly consistent in the basic idea and its repetition. However, the underlying harmony that supports the presentation phrase (mm. 2–6) is somewhat unclear: the dyad heard immediately in the piano in m. 1 suggests either the tonic and third of a B♭-major triad or the third and fifth of a G-minor triad; the key signature agrees with either of these two readings. As the piano doubles the voice at the unison through m. 7, the F⁴s might point the listener toward G minor; however, these F⁴s in mm. 2 and 4 resolve upward by a whole-step to G♯⁴, seemingly “too far” as they overshoot G#. It is not until the piano begins to part ways with the voice in mm. 8–10 (the beginning of the continuation phrase) that a functional progression—which leads to a perfect authentic cadence—is detected. But, curiously, this progression points toward B♭ minor—a key area neither suggested by the opening dyad nor emphasized by D♯, F♯, and G♯ in the opening six measures. In light of these harmonic features through the opening measures of the song, I propose a retrospective analysis that observes the emphasis on D♯ and F♯ through m. 5 as an
Figure 2.5. “Leises Lied,” Op. 39, No. 1, mm. 1–10; Form Overlay.
auxiliary progression, beginning on $III\#$ in the key of $B\flat$ major. Auxiliary progressions are quite common ways in which Strauss begins his songs (recall the opening of “Mohnblumen,” and note other examples in this and following chapters in which auxiliary progressions begin songs). One need not worry that the $F_4$ in the voice (and doubled in the piano) is dissonant with respect to the $B\flat$ in the piano accompaniment; rather this dissonance arises over the $III\#$ because of the accompanimental ostinato. Furthermore, my reading of $III\#$ in mm. 2–5 supports the Kopfton of this song ($D5, \tilde{3}$), in addition to marking a modal, parallel-key transformation over the course of the entire sentence (through m. 10) from $B\flat$ major to $B\flat$ minor. Accordingly, $\tilde{3}$ of the Urlinie is inflected as $b \tilde{3}$ upon this change in mode—first introduced over the cadential six-four in m. 9.\(^{10}\)

Though the presentation phrase of this sentence does not perfectly exhibit a Classical-model sentence in terms of its harmonic profile, it does exhibit many features that are worth distilling in order to make sense of Strauss’s elaborations of the Classical model-sentence paradigm. First, a 2-bar basic idea is stated. Second, the 2-bar basic idea is restated, supported by exactly the same harmonic underpinnings ($III\#$). Even though the repetition of the basic idea is expanded by one measure as the result of the one-beat displacement, the nearly identical pitch and rhythmic content of the basic idea and its repetition remain in dialogue with the structure of a Classical presentation phrase.

The bit of harmonic ambiguity in the presentation phrase is compensated for by the increasing harmonic clarity in the continuation phrase (mm. 7–10). In contrast with the presentation, the continuation lacks the recall and fragmentation of melodic-motivic material from the presentation, which, in the Classical tradition, is of particular rhetorical significance to the continuation’s forward-moving, striving effect. What does remain in the continuation phrase,

\(^{10}\) The inflection of the Kopfton as $\tilde{3}$ is later rectified to $\tilde{3}$; the song concludes in $B\flat$ major.
however, is a goal-directed, functional progression that reaches a perfect authentic cadence in m. 10. This progression begins with the apparent VI chord in m. 7 as it descends to the strong $\text{IV}^7$ in m. 8. In all, Strauss does not completely abandon the Classical model-sentence paradigm; however, Strauss’s exceptions and amendments to the characteristic Classical-model sentences here convey his Romantic style and the ways in which he stretches Classical conventions. The general effusiveness of the Romantic era is evident in Strauss’s elaborations of Classical formal paradigms (here and elsewhere), and, as is the case in “Leises Lied,” a detailed investigation of how Strauss's formal structures remain in close dialogue with Classical formal structures allows us to situate his development and expression of preexisting formal models.

The poetic structure and rhyme scheme of “Leises Lied” recalls the issue of internal rhyming pairs, which I first addressed in my discussion of “Befreit.” The following commentary on the rhyme scheme present in “Leises Lied” will relate to some of the topics we have already considered, in addition to connecting this with similar principles in “Ich trage meine Minne”—the next song I analyze in this chapter. Notice in the first stanza of “Leises Lied” that rhyming pairs group together lines 1 & 3 (“Garten” and “warten”) and 2 & 4 (“Schacht” and “Nacht”).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Leises Lied</strong></th>
<th><strong>Quiet Song</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Richard Dehmel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In einem stillen Garten</td>
<td>In a silent garden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An eines Brunnen Schacht,</td>
<td>At the shaft of a well,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wie wollt’ ich gerne warten</td>
<td>How gladly would I wait</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Die lange graue Nacht!</td>
<td>The long grey night through.¹¹</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The inherent property of such a rhyme scheme suggests the possibility of a two- or four-part equal division when set to music—that is, where lines 1 & 2 and 3 & 4 are set together as two distinct units (2-part division), or where each line is an individual unit (4-part division). In either case,

---

¹¹ Translation mine.
Classical-model sentence proportions are ruled out. In other words, in the case of the two- or four-part division, a 1:1:2 ratio is lost. Notice that in “Leises Lied,” however, Strauss smooths over the word “warten” (line 3, which rhymes with line 1) in order to construct a single-unit continuation phrase that does not place too much emphasis on the internal rhyme or distort the continuous nature of the continuation phrase. Strauss not only achieves this by way of the consistent eighth notes in the right hand of the piano, but also by the descending chromatic bassline which suggests two dissonant chords under “warten”: $P_4$ and $\frac{7}{4}$ (m. 8). These two chords cannot provide a stable arrival point; therefore, Strauss’s integration of these two dissonant chords—the second of which is the phrase’s strong predominant harmony—in conjunction with the steady eighth-note accompaniment smooths over the internal rhyming word in order to maintain an undivided continuation phrase. The accompaniment and harmonic plan of this passage also emphasize the continuation effect created by the enjambment in the poem—there is no comma at the end of line 3; therefore, Strauss’s musical setting of this stanza highlights the continuous nature of lines 3 and 4.

As we will see below in my analysis of “Ich trage meine Minne” (pp. 57–63, as well as some other songs with similar features), Strauss frequently uses a strong predominant harmony in order to maintain musical continuity at moments where there are inherent divisions in the poetry. We will also see that Strauss does not limit himself to maintaining musical continuity only by way of harmony; rather, he often cleverly bridges and smooths these textual divisions through the integration of melodic-motivic material derived from the presentation phrase (which, of course, is also characteristic of continuation-phrase fragmentation).

Before departing from this example, I would like to mention one more characteristic of this song that appears fairly frequently in Strauss’s song literature. “Leises Lied,” like “Mohnblumen,” begins with an auxiliary progression (Figure 2.6). Admittedly, the auxiliary progression in this song is less obviously displayed; however, from a voice-leading perspective, the emphasis on D4 when the
singer enters in m. 2 (doubled in the piano) can be regarded as the bass of an implied first-inversion B♭-major chord, which is prolonged and initiates a cadential progression. As mentioned above, a tonal center remains unclear in this song until somewhere near to m. 8, when the predominant harmony is introduced. However, from the vantage point of an auxiliary opening, we can imply B♭ major at the beginning of the song, whose modal shift to the parallel minor depicts the “long grey night” through which the poem’s speaker attempts regularly to find their lost lover in the stars that shine down onto the water in the well. Furthermore, the rhetorical gesture of the auxiliary opening portrays the wandering, searching routine in which the speaker continuously engages, only to search once more for the eyes of their lover to no avail.


Strauss’s “Ich trage meine Minne” (“I Bear My Love for You”), Op. 32, No. 1 (1896–1897), is an example of a Classical-model sixteen-measure sentence (Figure 2.7). Recall that Caplin defines the configuration of sixteen-measure sentences as: c.b.i. + c.b.i. + continuation. The presentation phrase of “Ich trage meine Minne” contains a repeated compound basic idea (4-bars + 4-bars, mm. 1–4 + 5–8), followed by an 8-bar continuation phrase that exhibits fragmentation of the basic idea,
Figure 2.7. “Ich trage meine Minne,” Op. 32, No. 1, mm. 1–16; Form Overlay.
an expanded cadential progression (mm. 9–16), concluding with a perfect authentic cadence.

The presentation phrase of “Ich trage meine Minne” comprises a repeated 4-bar compound basic idea: b.i. (mm. 1–2) + c.i. (mm. 3–4), repeated in mm. 5–6 (b.i.) and 7–8 (c.i.). Within the presentation phrase, both the basic and contrasting ideas exhibit melodic-motivic and harmonic features that link together their respective first and second iterations. The first two measures of each statement of the compound basic idea (mm. 1–2 and 5–6) exhibit an underlying arpeggiation of the tonic triad, supported by sustained tonic harmony. Note these two arpeggios: in mm. 1–2 the vocal melody and piano accompaniment arpeggiates $\text{Db}_4–\text{Gb}_4–\text{Bb}_4$ ($5–\hat{1}–\hat{3}$, labeled x in Figures 2.7 and 2.8) and in mm. 5–6 they arpeggiate $\text{Bb}_4–\text{Db}_5–\text{Gb}_5$ ($\tilde{3}–\tilde{5}–\hat{1}$, labeled “x” in Figures 2.7 and 2.8). Though the arpeggios are not identical in terms of the order of their scale degrees, the second arpeggio in mm. 5–6 extends the first in mm. 1–2 as the melody reaches for tonic at the end of m. 6. Furthermore, each iteration of the compound basic idea maintains tonic-prolongational function, according to the parameters of the Classical model.
The contrasting ideas in each iteration of the compound basic idea are linked by melodic-motivic and harmonic content, too. In fact, the two statements of the contrasting idea (mm. 3–4 and 7–8) create the effect of a statement-response repetition for the entire presentation phrase. The unfolded third in mm. 3–4, Ab–B♭–Gb (2–3–4, labeled y in Figures 2.7 and 2.8), over the dominant-seventh harmony, proposes a statement to which the contrasting idea responds and resolves in mm. 7–8, G♭–Ab–B♭ (1–2–3, labeled “y” in Figures 2.7 and 2.8), over the tonic triad. This statement-response-like repetition builds upon ideas set forth by Caplin in his description of Classical-model sentences. Here, however, I adapt the idea to a sixteen-measure sentence. In Caplin’s study of Classical instrumental music, a statement-response repetition functions among two parameters: melodic-motivic design and harmonic underpinnings, which he describes as follows:

The statement of a basic idea receives a response when an original version supported primarily by tonic harmony is answered by a repeated version supported by dominant harmony. […] One important type of statement-response repetition involves the motion away from tonic to dominant (I–V) in the statement and a return from the dominant to the tonic (V–I) in the response. […] Most statement-response repetitions involve transposing the melody to a different scale-degree in order to accommodate the change in harmonization.¹²

¹² Caplin, Classical Form, 39 (Caplin’s emphasis).
For Caplin, the statement-response repetition happens in immediate succession among a basic idea and its repetition in terms of the melodic-motivic and harmonic content he describes. In “Ich trage meine Minne,” however, the statement and response happens over a larger span, though the paradigm still links together the opening of the first compound basic idea to the dominant, and the closing of the second compound basic idea to the tonic. In addition, not only is melodic-motivic and harmonic content that Caplin describes at play in this song, but, additionally, both the poetry and the rhythm to which it is set participate in the statement-response repetition. The poetry and its translation for this excerpt is given below; note especially the rhyming words “Minne”/“Sinne” and “stumm”/“herum” that link together each iteration of the basic and contrasting ideas.

**Ich trage meine Minne**  
*Karl Friedrich Henckell*

Ich trage meine Minne vor Wonne  
stumm  
im Herzen und im Sinne mit mir herum  
Ja, dass ich dich gefunden, du liebes Kind,  
das freut mich alle Tage, die mir beschrieben sind.

I bear my love for you with wonder and silence  
in my heart and in my soul,  
yes: that I have found you, my darling,  
fills me with joy every day that is granted to me.  

Aside from the rhyme scheme, melodic-motivic, and harmonic features that unify the presentation phrase, the rhythmic values associated with the poetry—especially the contrasting idea—highlight the presentation’s cohesion and statement-response characteristics. Notice how in mm. 3–4 the steady quarter notes of the voice’s melody, the accompaniment, and the rests in both melody and accompaniment join together with mm. 5–8. (Certainly the slight discrepancy in the placement of the sixteenth-note rests in mm. 3 and 7 is due to the syllabic character of “stumm” and “herum.”) In all, the arpeggios, the pair of unfolded thirds, the harmonic underpinnings, the poetry’s

---

rhyme scheme, and the rhythms to which the poetry is set contribute to a unified, if not quite Classically tightly-knit, presentation phrase.

The continuation phrase of “Ich trage meine Minne” (mm. 9–16) begins with a transference of the basic idea’s melodic-motivic content to the bass voice of the piano. Specifically, the first basic idea appears literally in mm. 9–10 and is later transposed to the supertonic region in mm. 12–13 (refer back to Figure 2.7). According to the Classical model, the inclusion and fragmentation of the basic idea is part and parcel of continuation phrases; however, it is nearly always seen in an upper melodic voice of the texture rather than transferred to the bass—which is the case here. The migration of melodic-motivic material is yet another example of how Romantic-era composers like Strauss elaborate Classical paradigms. The recurrence of the basic idea in literal and transposed forms is not the only element of fragmentation in the continuation phrase. In mm. 9–10 the singer’s melody arpeggiates the tonic triad (3–5–1), recalling the arpeggio in the second statement of the basic idea in mm. 5–6. Furthermore, the Ab nestled within this arpeggiation and the four-note melody Gb4–Ab4–Gb5–Bb4 in mm. 14–15 make explicit reference to the prominent reachings over in the presentation phrase’s mm. 2 and 6.

The continuation phrase of “Ich trage meine Minne” is also quite Classical in nature by way of its underlying harmonic structure. In fact, the harmonic underpinnings of the continuation phrase comprise what Caplin describes as an expanded cadential progression (ECP): an expansion of the cadential progression [I6–II6 or IV–V–I] to the extent of supporting a complete phrase (of at least four measures) or group of phrases.14 The only deviation from this cadential plan is the tonicization of II in m. 11, which is prompted by the chromatic tones in the inner voices of the piano. If we examine all of m. 11, notice how the F4 over IV/II falls to the accented passing tone Fb4 (over

14 Caplin, *Classical Form*, 254.
V\(^7\)/II), which then falls to the eighth-note \(\text{I}^{\flat}4\) (also over \(V\)^7/II) that serves as the pickup to the transposed basic idea in mm. 12–13. In all, the addition of the tonicization of II to the expanded cadential progression serves a voice-leading purpose—as a way of preparing harmonically and melodically the transposed basic idea in the supertonic area. Notice also that this transposed version of the basic idea smooths over a division point in the poetry (between lines 3 and 4, mm. 12 in the song); therefore, its pick-up to m. 12 and conclusion in m. 13 bridges the textual gap in service of maintaining the continuity and forward motion of the continuation phrase in spite of the poem's division point.

The resulting structure of the continuation in this song portrays the basic characteristics of a Classical sixteen-measure sentence design, though in some ways it is more inventive than the Classical model. For one thing, Strauss’s emphasis on the supertonic region (by way of local tonicization) in the continuation phrase accomplishes a similar text-setting goal as his introduction of the \(\chi IV^{\flat7}\) chord in m. 8 of “Leises Lied”—that is, recall how Strauss used a strong predominant harmony in the continuation phrase to propel the music at a moment where an internal rhyme and line-end in the poetry was present. Similarly, the supertonic region in “Ich trage meine Minne” serves to thrust the continuation phrase toward its cadence. In addition to the underlying harmony, Strauss weaves in the fragment of the basic idea over the supertonic harmony, intensifying the rhetorical aspects of the continuation phrase and further smoothing over the division point in the poetry. As mentioned above, it is not uncommon for Strauss to use harmony and melodic-motivic references to his advantage when attempting to deemphasize internal poetic divisions—whether by way of line-ends or rhyme scheme. In all, this technique of fusing two lines of poetry into a single, continuous musical unit allows songs like “Ich trage meine Minne” and “Leises Lied” to maintain a sentential structure, even when the poetic structure goes against this design.

“Winternacht” (“Winter Night”), Op. 15, No. 2 (1884–1886), is an example of an enlarged Straussian hybrid sentence. Like “Ich trage meine Minne,” “Winternacht” spans sixteen measures with a regular 4-bar + 4-bar + 8-bar configuration; however, its harmonic underpinnings are a bit more colorful and unconventional (Figure 2.9). Notice first that, following a four-measure introduction, the two larger units of the sentence—the “presentation”\(^\text{15}\) and continuation phrases—are divided by the mediant chord in m. 12. As mentioned in my description of hybrid sentences, the “presentation” phrases are to be either strictly tonic or tonic Stufe prolongational. On the surface of the music, the mediant chord is very locally tonicized and appears to disrupt tonic prolongation; however, a closer look at the underlying voice leading, specifically the bassline, reveals that the mediant chord is simply a local harmonization of the upper third of the tonic triad (a third-divider)—from G minor at the beginning of the song to B♭ major in m. 12. Strauss completes a full bassline arpeggiation through the tonic triad at the cadence on the minor dominant in m. 20. Overall, this passage comprises a complete arpeggio through the tonic triad in a way that divides the sentence evenly and highlights the midpoint of the form (Figure 2.10).

Like all sentences, another feature of hybrid sentences is that they must conclude with an authentic cadence, though it need not be in the tonic key area. In the case of “Winternacht,” the sentence structure concludes with a perfect authentic cadence in (minor)\(V_\flat\) (even though (major)\(V^\#\) was introduced in m. 16, but only as a local harmony that divides an ascending sixth in the bass between B♭1 (m. 12) and G2 (m. 17, refer again to my bassline voice-leading sketch in Figure 2.10, in which I have normalized the register)). The G2 in m. 17 initiates an auxiliary progression which leads to the cadence on \(V_\flat\) in m. 20. The ultimate arrival on \(V_\flat\) rather than \(V^\#\) highlights the nearness of

\(^{15}\) Recall that I place “presentation” in quotation marks when referring to hybrid themes, where a true presentation phrase—according to Caplin’s Classical-model sentence—is not present.
Figure 2.9. “Winternacht,” Op. 15, No. 2, mm. 1–20; Form Overlay.
Figure 2.9 – continued

Figure 2.10. “Winternacht,” Op. 15, No. 2, mm. 1–20; Bassline Voice-Leading Sketch.
the two keys visited in this song through m. 20—that is, in a minor key, V#, of course, is more closely related to the home key than V$\sharp$).

The inner workings of this hybrid sentence are quite normative in nature; in fact, the melodic design is beautifully unified in this excerpt. First, a 4-bar basic idea (mm. 5–8), supported entirely by tonic expansion, presents the important melodic-motivic content that is later fragmented in the continuation. The basic idea is followed by a 4-bar contrasting idea (mm. 9–12) that is unrelated to the basic idea in terms of its melodic-motivic content, contour, and harmonic support. An 8-bar continuation phrase follows (mm. 13–20), with fragments of the basic idea, specifically the melodic gesture found in mm. 6–8. Notice that as the fragments of the basic idea increase the surface activity in the continuation phrase, the continuation itself exhibits its own kind of nested “sentence” structure by way of these fragments. To be sure, the “sentence” embedded within the continuation does not exhibit many of the requirements of true sentence structure; however, it does, at least, fulfill the proportions and melodic-motivic requirements associated with sentences: 2 bars (mm. 13–14, b.i.) + 2 bars (mm. 15–16, b.i. repeated/transposed) + 4 bars (mm. 17–20, continuation to cadence with fragments of b.i.). Also, based on the melodic-motivic content established in the “real” basic idea (mm. 5–12), the “basic ideas” in the continuation’s “sentence” sound too medial to be associated with true presentation/initiation function since they are so strongly associated with the “real” basic idea of this hybrid sentence. Furthermore, they are not supported by tonic harmony.

In all, the rhetorical aspects associated with continuation function are heightened in “Winternacht.” Strauss’s layering of an embedded “sentence” in the continuation phrase creates a doubled sense of the goal-directedness and kinetic energy that leads to and confirms the final cadence, which I believe plays an important role in establishing the enlarged Straussian hybrid sentence form in these sixteen measures. To elaborate on this point, let us revisit the local tonicization of the mediant chord in m. 12. For those who hear a true cadence on III in m. 12, the
idea of sentence structure in mm. 5–20 becomes an immediate impossibility. Hearing that cadence might lead me to view this excerpt as a small binary form: first part (mm. 5–12, with a cadence on III) and second part (mm. 13–20, with a cadence on Vⁿ). Though this perspective acknowledges the possibility of a cadence in m. 12 on an extremely detailed and shallow structural level, it does not depict particularly well Caplin’s definition of small binary theme.

Caplin describes the first part of a small binary as usually constructed as an eight-measure theme of conventional organization (sentence, period, or hybrid). This theme may remain in the home key or modulate to a subordinate key, and it may close with any kind of the three cadential types—half, perfect authentic, or (rarely) imperfect authentic.¹⁶

In the case of “Winternacht,” the first eight measures could be read as sentential: b.i. (mm. 5–6) + c.i. (mm. 7–8) + cadential (mm. 9–12). Notice that this construction is problematic in at least two ways. On one hand, this reading necessitates the splitting of the word “Sturmgebrause” (“storm shower”) in mm. 6–8 to “Sturm—gebrause” in order to tease out a separate basic idea and contrasting idea. Though “Sturmgebrause” is a compound word to which this particular splitting attends, it dismantles the thoroughness of the entire first line of the poetry and the way in which the poem’s speaker describes how they greet the December moon.

Winternacht
Adolf von Schack

Mit Regen und Sturmgebrause
sei mir willkommen, Dezembermond,
und führe mich den Weg zum traumlichen Hause,
wo meine liebste Herrin wohnt.

Winter Night

With rain and [storm shower]
I bid you welcome, moon of December,
show me the way to the snug little house
where my beloved lady lives.¹⁷

On the other hand, from a harmonic and form-function perspective, the designation of the entire 8-bar unit as b.i. + c.i. + cadential neither comprises a Caplinian sentence nor one of his hybrid

¹⁶ Caplin, *Classical Form*, 87.
theme-types—that is, there is no continuation to even suggest a Hybrid 3 model. In addition, the imperfect authentic cadence in m. 12 is, according to Caplin, a rarity at the end of the first part of a small binary theme-type. Furthermore, this cadence is weakened by the placement of $\hat{5}$ in the melody and by the retention of $A_\flat$—the leading tone—in the mediant chord. Accordingly, and with these details in mind, it is difficult to regard mm. 5–12 as the first part of a small binary theme-type.

If, however, we do consider mm. 5–12 as the first part of a small binary theme-type, perhaps it is slightly easier to account for the second part of the theme-type (mm. 13–20) as displaying a relatively normative construction according to Caplin’s theory. He notes that

> [t]he second part of the small binary begins, in the majority of cases, with a four-measure unit identical in organization to a contrasting middle (B section) of the small ternary [which is more loosely organized and often emphasizes the dominant harmony]. The material that follows [this section] can express a variety of functions (though not a recapitulation): some are entirely conventional, such as continuation, cadential, or consequent, whereas others cannot be described with simple labels. Less frequently, the second part of a small binary contains no contrasting middle and is constructed instead as a single themelike unit, often having sentential or periodic characteristics. No matter how the second part is constructed, it always concludes with a perfect authentic cadence in the home key. [Finally,] the melodic material opening the second part usually derives from the basic idea of the first part.  

Most of what Caplin says here can be used to describe mm. 13–20 of “Winternacht”: first, in Caplin’s “less frequent,” but possible, case, these measures comprise their own sentence-like structure (as described above); second, the melodic material derives from the basic idea. However, what does not align with Caplin’s theory is that the dominant harmony is not expressed at the beginning of the second part; rather, it is not achieved until m. 16, and the music ultimately cadences in this key area, which is not the tonic. In sum, the entirety of this excerpt fits too loosely into a small binary model for me to regard it as such; rather, its construction emphasizes the melodic-motivic, harmonic, and rhetorical features associated with hybrid sentences.

---

18 Caplin, *Classical Form*, 89.
But why suggest an alternative analysis at all? The first reason for doing so is an important aspect of this project. As I examine Classical theme-type designs in Strauss’s songs, I acknowledge that not all formal structures—by way of their melodic-motivic, harmonic, and/or rhetorical content—will always fit within one category. Rather, I strive to situate Strauss’s songs within broader concepts of Classical theme-types and their extensions in the Romantic era, which often requires me to attend to the songs from multiple vantage points, therefore creating multiple interpretations in some cases. Second, with “Winternacht” in mind, specifically, I return to an observation made above that I believe points to the reading of this song as a sentence rather than any other theme-type. Recall my discussion of the song’s continuation phrase: the continuation not only fulfill its rhetorical purpose of increasing surface motion and pointing toward the cadence, but the embedded sentence structure within the continuation heightens this sense of forward motion and goal-directedness. If we think about the moment in this song that creates the most uncertainty regarding its formal structure, it is the mediant chord in m. 12, to which I have now dedicated a significant amount of discussion. In order to minimize the effect of a “true” cadence being heard in this location, I contend that Strauss constructs a continuation phrase whose embedded sentence structure and propulsion toward the final cadence is doubly strong—that is, there is retrospectively no mistake that mm. 13–20 comprise the continuation phrase of a sentence unfolding in time. By so doing, Strauss creates a musical structure that poses a certain amount of formal ambiguity in one particular location, though this ambiguity is clarified thereafter by the music itself. Therefore, the continuation phrase in “Winternacht” takes on a decidedly important rhetorical role that helps the listener make sense of the “presentation” phrase’s curious ending.


The first stanza of “Wiegenliedchen” (“Little Cradle Song”), Op. 49, No. 3 (1900–1901), is another example of an expanded Straussian hybrid sentence (Figure 2.11). The span of the sentence
Figure 2.11. “Wiegenliedchen,” Op. 49, No. 3, mm. 1–13; Form Overlay.
Figure 2.11 – continued

is eleven measures, comprising a 4-bar “presentation” phrase (mm. 3–6) and a 7-bar continuation phrase (mm. 7–13). The “presentation” phrase includes a 2-bar basic idea (mm. 3–4, set over the accompanimental pattern established in m. 1) and a 2-bar contrasting idea (mm. 5–6, in which the entire “presentation” phrase is supported strictly by tonic prolongation).¹⁹

The continuation phrase begins in m. 7, accompanied by a nominal change in harmony via a 5–6 motion above tonic. In terms of continuation rhetoric, this song exhibits many of the usual characteristics: first, fragments of melodic-motivic material are present, deriving in part from the initial neighbor motion in the piano’s right hand and the rhythmicity of its left hand; second, these fragments (initially) increase the music’s surface activity as the continuation begins; third, the

¹⁹ I should like to note that the voice’s melodic contour in the basic idea and contrasting idea is different on the surface of the music, therefore prompting me to label these two ideas accordingly (rather than positing two iterations of a basic idea); however, in both the basic idea and—to a greater extent—the contrasting idea, the voice’s melody follows the left-hand accompanimental pattern in the piano, either by abbreviating it (as is the case in the basic idea) or adhering nearly perfectly to it (as is the case in the contrasting idea). While this feature of the basic and contrasting ideas is present at a slightly deeper structural level than the music’s immediate surface, I attempt to remain true to Caplin’s notion of contrasting foreground melodic phenomena as participating in the analysis of basic and contrasting ideas, rather than attending too strictly to deeper structural events or the fact that the underlying harmony prolongs tonic. As you will see from a later portion of my analysis of “Wiegenliedchen,” both the basic idea and the contrasting idea participate in a middleground arpeggio of the tonic triad at that becomes important in relating the continuation phrase to the “presentation” phrase.
introduction of the supertonic harmony in m. 12 progresses to the sentence’s cadence—a tonicized half cadence in the home key.

Despite the many harmonic and rhetorical features that contribute to the normativity of the continuation phrase, there are also several ways in which it is non-normative. First, the continuation loosens the expanded hybrid sentence’s structure by spanning a length greater than its normative proportion; rather than comprising an expected four-measure unit, the continuation phrase spans seven measures. Furthermore, after the 1-bar fragments in mm. 7 and 8 sound, the surface activity beings to slow: in mm. 9–11, fragmentation occurs in a 2-bar and a 1-bar configuration, compromising the sense of goal-directedness and expanding the continuation phrase to a disproportionate length.

Another way we might make sense of the curiosities presented in “Wiegenliedchen” is to examine the voice leading of the entire sentence structure (Figure 2.12). The “presentation” phrase makes evident an important underlying arpeggio motive. Note in my voice-leading sketch an arpeggio of the tonic triad from F⁴ (I) in m. 1 (and specifically emphasized by the voice’s entrance in m. 3) to A⁴ (♭3) in m. 5 to C⁴ (♭5) in m. 6—shown by the under-beam in Figure 2.12. Along the way, this arpeggio is decorated by two incomplete-neighbor tones: B (m. 4) and D⁵ (m. 6). Other than these incomplete-neighbors, the “presentation” phrase’s melody progresses completely by arpeggiation through the tonic triad.

At the middleground level, the continuation phrase—though expanded—matches exactly the arpeggio in the “presentation” phrase. Not only is the tonic arpeggio preserved, but implicit and explicit references to the incomplete-neighbor tones in the “presentation” phrase are made. First, in m. 9, the B⁴ that was an incomplete neighbor in m. 4 is now made complete, nestled between two A⁴s; second, in mm. 11–12, the D⁵ incomplete neighbor first heard in m. 6 remains an incomplete-neighbor tone in the continuation phrase—in fact, it is marked for consciousness by an
upper-third elaboration before falling to C♯5. What formal functions in this excerpts—presentation and/or continuation—might have remained unclear by way of strict formal and harmonic analysis on the music’s surface are clarified by the underlying voice leading. The two expressions of tonic arpeggiation define the boundaries between “presentation” and continuation in a way that pairs well with the sentence’s distorted proportions, grouping structure, and harmony.

Perhaps the tonicized half cadence in m. 13 leaves open the possibility of an impending consequent phrase—that is, perhaps mm. 1–13 function as an antecedent. However, following the tonicized half cadence is a three-measure piano interlude that resembles the introduction but highlights the key area of C♯ major. Paralleling the introduction, a “sentence” structure similar to the one just examined ensues; however, there is no cadence reached at the end of the continuation phrase; therefore, the possibility of a consequent phrase (perhaps comprising sentence structure) ultimately remains unrealized.

As for the poetry of this song, the first stanza supports the peculiarities of its expanded sentence structure. First, the stanza is broken into five lines—which is one line more than the other

---

20 Surely this analysis emphasizes a shallow middleground reading. As my voice leading sketch shows, the song simply prolongs at a deeper structural level the primary tone (♯5) through the first thirteen measures.
poems examined above. Second, the rhyme scheme groups together lines 2, 3, and 4, leaving lines 1 and 5 without a rhyming partner. As far as the coordination of the poetry with the overall form, line 1 comprises the basic idea, line 2 the contrasting idea, lines 3 and 4 fragments in the continuation, and line 5 the cadential unit.

Wiegenliedchen
Richard Dehmel

Bienchen, Bienchen
wiegt sich im Sonnenschein,
spielt um mein Kindelein,
summt dich in Schlummer ein,
süsses Gesicht.

Little Cradle Song

Little bee, little bee,
cradles in the sunshine,
plays about my little child,
humming you into slumber,
sweet face.\textsuperscript{21}

Lines 3 and 4 are the most curious in terms of the expanded sentence structure. It is hard to argue that the omission of one or the other reveals a more normative structure and balances the proportions in the music; rather, Strauss uses to his advantage the fact that lines 3 and 4 do rhyme—in fact, this helps the listener aurally connect the two lines of poetry as they relate to line 2.

In an attempt to group together lines 3 and 4 in a way that also corresponds with my formal analysis, I regard these lines as providing extra textual material that is best made sense of by accounting for them hypermetrically as single large measures within an expanded 8-bar phrase model (Figure 2.11, see especially the phrase counts between the vocal staff and the grand staff). I also support this particular reading by my harmonic and voice-leading analyses. First, the 5–6 motion in m. 7 signals a new musical unit (the beginning of the continuation phrase, in this case), and the melodic arrival on A\#4 in m. 9 plays an important role in the composed-out arpeggio in the continuation phrase. In all, this first stanza of “Wiegenliedchen” allows us to realize that in many of Strauss’s songs the analysis of boundaries within and between presentation, continuation, and

\textsuperscript{21} Translation mine.
cadential units is often informed by an examination of many musical parameters rather than just the
harmony, melody, voice-leading, and/or poetry alone.


Strauss’s “Allerseelen” (“All Souls’ Day”), Op. 10, No. 8 (1882–1883), is one of his most
hauntingly beautiful songs, depicting sorrowful reminiscence, yet set in a major key. The song’s
opening eleven measures comprise an expanded Straussian hybrid sentence that begins in the piano
at the start of the song (Figure 2.13). The “presentation” phrase conforms to a 4-bar compound
basic idea model, with a 2-bar basic idea and a 2-bar contrasting idea that are unrelated in terms of
their melodic-motivic, harmonic, and rhythmic content. Rather than prolonging tonic, the
“presentation” phrase progresses to a supertonic chord (m. 4), on which it stalls for six measures. As
the contrasting idea remains stuck in place, two versions of melodic-motivic fragments (and sub-
fragments) are heard in the piano: the first is the related pair of G4–B♭4–Ab4 appoggiatura mm. 3–4
and the C5–G4–Ab4 retardation in mm. 4–5 (shown in Figure 2.13 by braces); the second is the
ascending eighth-note-to dotted-quarter-note gesture Ab4–B♭4–C5–Ab5–Ab5 and (sub-fragments
thereof) in mm. 5–8 (distinguished in Figure 2.13 by a complete bracket for the initial statement and
partial brackets for the fragments). This particular gesture in mm. 5–8 derives from the first half of
the contrasting idea (pick-up to m. 3), whereas the appoggiatura gesture at the end of m. 3 through
the middle of m. 4 is answered by the retardation.

These fragments and sub-fragments persist through the entrance of the voice in m. 7. The
voice acts as a “corrective phrase” to the stalled “presentation” in the piano, comprising its own
“presentation” phrase in the form of a compound basic idea. The voice’s basic idea loosely recalls
the first half of the piano’s contrasting idea. As per my description as “corrective phrase,” the voice
leads the piano’s stalled “presentation” to m. 11, where both the “presentation” phrase in the voice
Figure 2.13. “Allerseelen,” Op. 10, No. 8, mm. 1–17; Form Overlay.
Figure 2.13 – continued

**Allerseelen**
*Hermann von Gilm*

Stell’ auf den Tisch die duftenden Reseden,  
die letzten roten Astern trag’ herbei,  
und lass uns wieder von der Liebe reden,  
wie einst im Mai.

**All Souls’ Day**

Set on the table the fragrant mignonettes,  
bring in the last red asters,  
and let us talk of love again  
as we once did in May.\(^\text{22}\)

\(^{22}\) Translation: Jefferson, *The Lieder*, 56.
and piano conclude. The purpose of the corrective phrase, then, is to “unstick” the piano’s “stuck” continuation phrase, reestablish a sense of goal-directedness on the musical surface (which became lost in the piano accompaniment), and guide the phrase to its conclusion.

In its attempt to reset and guide the piano’s “presentation” phrase, the voice experiences rhythmic and melodic disunity with the piano. In terms of rhythm and meter, notice in mm. 7–8 that the rhythmic figuration in the piano does not coordinate well with the voice, nor do they accentuate the same beats in these measures: the piano emphasizes beats 2 and 4 of the measures, whereas the voice—more squarely and normatively—emphasizes beats 1 and 3. Metric and rhythmic alignment is restored in the pick-up to m. 9. In terms of melody, the voice and piano oppose each other’s contour in the first half of m. 10, but join one another in the second half of the measure. Overall, the voice’s “corrective phrase” accomplishes its goal; however, the formal ramifications come by way of a greatly expanded and elaborated “presentation” phrase whose span is eleven measures, and whose structure features two simultaneously occurring phrases. In terms of conveying this “presentation” phrase as an expansion and elaboration of a normative 4-bar model, I have indicated phrase counts between the voice and piano staves in order to show the stalled piano “presentation” and the hypermetric realignment by way of the voice’s “corrective phrase.” In all, this particular passage highlights how a formal issue presented early on in a form is remedied at a later point by the cooperation of a number of musical features. Furthermore, this passage also serves as an exemplary depiction of an expanded “presentation” phrase—which, as mentioned before, is generally uncommon in Strauss’s songs, especially compared with the abundance of expanded continuation phrases.

From a harmonic perspective, m. 11 appears to function locally as an IAC in the home key; however, this “cadence” is only apparent. Instead, it marks non-cadential harmonic closure that simply prolongs tonic and supports the completion of a significant and frequent melodic-motivic
upper-neighbor motion (G–Ab–G) in this song, which spans the “presentation” phrase. Furthermore, if m. 11 is considered a cadence, the label “presentation” does not fit: true or apparent presentation phrases do not Classically end with a cadence (according to the Classical paradigm).

Notice in Figure 2.14 (a voice-leading sketch of just the “presentation” phrase) how Strauss composes out the upper-neighbor G–Ab–G motive in mm. 1–11. Governed by the underlying tonic harmony, the melodic goal of the piano’s contrasting idea is Ab, which marks the onset of the structural neighbor tone. The Ab is first marked for consciousness as the last note of the contrasting idea, which is prolonged in the piano through m. 10 and highlighted further by the registral transfer (by octave) in mm. 5–7 (which is also recalled and magnified for rhetorical purposes in the final stanza of this song). As the piano’s contrasting idea continues to spin out, the voice enters with its “corrective phrase” and meets the piano at Ab4 by descending a third from C5, all still supported by the supertonic triad. By m. 10, the Ab neighbor tone that was first introduced in a consonant state (a 10th in m. 4) is now transformed to the chordal dissonance in the dominant-seventh chord (a 7th in m. 10), which prompts the resolution and completion of this neighbor tone to G4 (as a 10th over Eb2) in m. 11. As mentioned above, the Ab neighbor tone has greater significance in the overall structure of the song than in just these opening eleven measures. As the song progresses, the Ab marks the formal boundary of the song’s B section, in addition to serving as the song’s climactic note in the recapitulation. To see the connection between the present analysis and my analysis of the rest of this song, please refer to Chapter 4, Figures 4.3 and 4.4 (pp. 131 and 137, respectively).

In response to this song’s expanded “presentation” phrase, Strauss integrates a 6-bar continuation phrase (mm. 12–17), whose span appears to compensate for the sentence’s lengthy first unit, and whose melodic-motivic profile—supported by delightfully transitory harmonic

underpinnings—is closely related to the “presentation” (Figure 2.15). The continuation phrase includes many of the normative characteristics, such as melodic-motivic fragmentation, liquidation, and a functional progression to a cadence, though with elaborations and modifications. Fragmentation here occurs in two durations: the first fragment of the continuation phrase spans two measures (mm. 12–13), and the second two fragments span a single measure (m. 14 and m. 15, respectively). Strauss’s integration of a 2-bar fragment and two 1-bar fragments recalls the interplay between the greatly expanded 11-bar piano “presentation” and the normative 4-bar voice “presentation”—in other words, elements of an expanded structure and a normative structure are also present in the continuation phrase. These melodic-motivic fragments liquidate upon the downbeat of m. 16, where the piano continues two measures past the voice, marking a half cadence in $b$VII ($Db$ major). This harmonic region is arrived at by a stepwise bassline beginning on $Eb$ at the end of the “presentation” phrase (m. 11) and continuing to $Ab$1 at m. 16, marking the conclusion of the continuation phrase (and whose octave designations here reflect the score rather than the normalized realization in Figure 2.15). While a half cadence in the home key would be more representative of Strauss’s sentences that do end with some kind of half cadence, this colorful half
Figure 2.15. “Allerseelen,” Op. 10, No. 8, mm. 1–17; Voice-Leading Sketch.
cadence in $bVII$ yields the harmonic closure necessary for the completion of this expanded (and elaborated) hybrid sentence.

Lastly, Strauss integrates another statement of the G–Ab–G neighbor-tone motive in the continuation phrase. Literally, the Ab’s return to G is incomplete if we do not consider the first measure of music after the conclusion of the continuation phrase (that is, m. 18). Notice in m. 18 that the second larger formal region (B) begins. The underlying C-minor harmony supports G4 in the melody, to which the neighbor tone Ab₄—supported by $bVII$ at the HC—returns. In this way, Strauss couples this melodic-motivic structural event in the continuation with its earlier appearance in the “presentation.” This melodic-motivic consistency recalls similarities in the “presentation” and continuation phrases of “Wiegenliedchen.” In all, such unifying features help the listener make sense of musical units that initially appear disparate, but ultimately cohere.
CHAPTER 3
PERIODS AND THEIR ELABORATIONS


Just as “Befreit” served as an exemplar of a sentence in Strauss’s songs (Figures 2.1 and 2.2, pp. 40–46), “Für fünfzehn Pfennige” (“For Fifteen Pennies”), Op. 36, No. 2 (1897–1898), illustrates one of Strauss’s relatively strict periodic designs, albeit with a Straussian Romantic flare. As William Caplin describes, the Classical-model period is divided into two sections: a 4-bar antecedent (4-bar c.b.i.) and a 4-bar consequent (repetition of the c.b.i. but with modification in order to create a stronger cadence in order to close the theme).¹ “Für fünfzehn Pfennige” exceeds Caplin’s defined 8-bar span of periods; rather, the song comprises a 13-bar span with the configuration 6-bar antecedent + 1 bar of silence + 6-bar consequent. The internal division of the antecedent and consequent phrase reflects the divisions in the poetry.

Für fünfzehn Pfennige
German Folksong

Das Mägdlein will ein’ Freier hab’n,
Und sollt’ sie’n aus der Erde grab’n,
Für fünfzehn Pfennige.

Sie grub wohl ein, sie grub wohl aus
Und grub nur einen Schreiber heraus
Für fünfzehn Pfennige.

For Fifteen Pennies

The maiden wants a suitor,
Even if she digs him out of the Earth,
For fifteen pennies.

She probably dug in, digging up at ease
And dug out just one Scribe,
For fifteen pennies.²

The antecedent comprises the entire first stanza, and the consequent comprises the second.

However, each stanza is broken up into three lines of text, which intuitively defies the equal division of the c.b.i. in both the antecedent and consequent phrases that Caplin addresses in his description of periods. Throughout the entire song, the phrase “Für fünfzehn Pfennige” concludes each stanza,

¹ Caplin, Classical Form, 49.
² Translation mine.
acting not only as an appendix to two-line text groupings, but also as the punch-line of the jokes as the poem’s maiden is enticed by the scribe’s riches but ultimately departs from him in order to keep her freedom. Strauss accounts for this appended line of text as a third idea in the antecedent and consequent phrases here (as well as an additional idea in later formal groupings of the poem’s stanzas). Figure 3.1 shows how the characteristic layout of b.i. + c.i. in the antecedent and consequent phrases is slightly enlarged here by the addition of “Für fünfzehn Pfennige,” which, for the purposes of this analysis, I call the “title idea” (abbreviated t.i.). The enlargement in the text, of course, corresponds with the enlargement in the length of the antecedent and consequent phrases.

Two other factors affect the tightness of this period in terms of its relationship to strict Classical-model periods. First, the harmonic plan of this period does not follow the most typical Classical layout. Specifically, following the tonic-key half cadence in m. 6, the consequent begins off-tonic in the supertonic region (m. 8). To be sure, the off-tonic start of the consequent phrase is not foreign to Classical music; in fact, Caplin makes note of this kind of harmonic plan in the first eight measures of Mozart’s Piano Sonata in D, K. 576, i. Second, and more subtle, the structure of the poetry in the second stanza is ever-so-slightly different from the structure of the first. Notice that there is an enjambment that fuses lines 1 and 2 of the second. As mentioned above, I rely upon the poetic structure to define the basic and contrasting ideas. You will notice in Figure 3.1 that I label b.i. and c.i. in analogous places in the antecedent and consequent phrases, especially because of the similarities in melodic-motivic content in both of these phrases. While I do not wish to make too much of a fuss over the enjambment, perhaps the fascinating misalignment of poetic and musical organization anticipates the turbulent back-and-forth of the decidedly independent maiden and the relentless—if not desperate—scribe. In all, the strict organization of the antecedent retrospectively clarifies this slight misalignment in the consequent.

3 Caplin, Classical Form, 52–53.
Figure 3.1. “Für fünfzehn Pfennige,” Op. 36, No. 2, mm. 1–13; Form Overlay.
The voice-leading structure of this song helps to clarify its periodic design (Figure 3.2). The overall shape of the piece takes on a quasi-interruption scheme, with the division of the form at the back-relating dominant in m. 6 (which ends the antecedent phrase). The second half of the structure prolongs the supertonic area and highlights the parallel construction of the consequent phrase as it relates to the antecedent. In fact, Strauss’s musical setting of these first two stanzas of poetry reveals something about their conclusiveness and partitioning in the poem as a whole. For example, the first stanza of the poem states the maiden’s initial desire: she wants to find a suitor, even if she has to dig him out of the ground. This stanza leaves open-ended the maiden’s hunt for a suitor, relating to the open-endedness of an antecedent phrase. But whom will the maiden find as a suitor? The answer lies within the second stanza: the maiden digs out a scribe, therefore providing a sense of poetic and musical conclusion to the reader’s wondering about who the suitor will be and how the consequent phrase closes the structure, respectively.

Figure 3.2. “Für fünfzehn Pfennige,” Op. 36, No. 2, mm. 1–13; Voice-Leading Sketch.

The voice-leading is intricately and subtly linked to the story told and the information conveyed in these opening two stanzas. First, the Kopfton (3, B4) is achieved in m. 4 at the word “Erde”/“Earth,” which pairs the structurally significant musical moment with the poetry’s wit in terms of where the maiden is ultimately going to find her suitor. Second, in the parallel location in
the consequent phrase (m. 11), the singer arrives on an incomplete-neighbor tone C♯5, pairing with the word “Schreiber”/“scribe.” At this location, yet another structural moment coincides with the poetry: just as the acquisition of the Kopfton marked where the maiden looks to find her suitor, the incomplete-neighbor tone marks whom she finds as her suitor.

2. “Ach weh mir unglückhaften Mann,” Op. 21, No. 4 (1887)

The curious formal aspects of “Ach weh mir unglückhaften Mann” (Alas, I am an Unlucky Man”), Op. 21, No. 4 (1887), are clarified primarily by the song’s melodic line. In the following discussion of this song, I offer three interpretations of this eight-measure excerpt (refer to Figure 3.3): my first interpretation highlights the normative melodic construction of this excerpt’s periodic design, noting especially how it intuitively captures the markers of the Classical-model period as they relate to phrase length and the melodic-motivic scheme; my second interpretation offers a reading of this excerpt as a single unit, considering its melodic-motivic and harmonic happenings and how they relate to what follows the eight measures presented here.

With respect to my first interpretation as a periodic design, this excerpt breaks into two units: an antecedent phrase (mm. 14–17) and a consequent phrase (mm. 18–21), each of which comprises a compound basic idea. The 4-bar + 4-bar configuration is also parallel in its melodic-motivic construction. In dialogue with Classical periods, the antecedent and consequent phrases begin identically, with melodic modifications for the weaker-to-stronger cadential hierarchy inherent in the periodic design. However, with all of these Classical features identified in this excerpt, there appears to be a noticeable lack of a “true” cadence at the midpoint of the form (m. 17). The harmonic profile of the antecedent phrase is curious: Strauss’s setting of the antecedent over a tonic pedal and ¹–⁵ ostinato in the accompaniment strips the first four measures of the possibility of a
cadence based on harmony alone. However, I suggest here that in texted music, other markers such as melody and—importantly—text-setting can also guide the sense of “cadence.”

Let us take for example the structure of the poetry for this excerpt:

Ach weh mir unglückhaften Mann
Felix Dahn
Ich putzte sie mit Schellen aus,
daß du mich hört’st von weitem,
ich steckt’ ein’n großen Rosenstrauß
an meine linke Seiten.

Alas, I Am an Unlucky Man

I would adorn them with bells,
so that you could hear them from afar;
I would stick a large bouquet of roses
on my left side.4

Most simply, the four lines of this stanza form two rhyming pairs: lines 1 & 3 and 2 & 4. In terms of the parallel construction of the text, then, these four lines of poetry support the parallel melodic and harmonic setting of the excerpt. While we have seen this kind of poetic construction in previous examples of sentences, its musical manifestation is more intuitively conducive to its setting as a musical period. Specifically, lines 1 and 2 establish a poetic construction that is repeated in lines 3 and 4; therefore, we can regard the ends of lines 2 and 4 as poetic arrival points, which, in many cases, relate to musical arrival points, if not cadences.

In the case of this song, Strauss compensates for the lack of harmonic motion in the antecedent phrase by the singer’s melodic profile and the organization of the poetry. Upon one’s hearing of what I call the consequent phrase, the listener can than retrospectively identify the antecedent-like nature of the first four measures in this excerpt. In terms of this retrospective hearing, I label m. 17 as a “melodic IAC,” in which the singer’s melody—paired with the structure and rhyme scheme of the poetry—yields a weak “cadence” at the midpoint of the form. Though the interaction of melody and poetry are the strongest indicators of the melodic IAC here, they are not the only factors involved in my identification of a melodic cadence. A weaker indicator—though

4 Translation mine.
Figure 3.3. “Ach weh unglückhaften Mann,” Op. 21, No. 4, mm. 11–21; Form Overlay.
chord is the first iteration of a chromatic event in these measures. Second, due to the harmonic profile of this common-tone diminished-seventh chord, C# is emphasized, which becomes increasingly motivically salient with respect to the cadential progression in mm. 20–21. Furthermore, the tendencies of the C# and A# in this chord aid in intensifying the motion back to the root-position tonic chord and its accompanying melodic arrival on 5 (D5). With respect to the periodic design, this weak cadence is answered by a stronger cadence in m. 21, where a PAC in V closes the form.

My first reading of this piece conveys a relatively strict periodic structure where a melodic IAC at the end of the antecedent phrase provokes a PAC in V at the end of the consequent phrase. However, my second reading—an alternative reading—does not observe any kind of cadence in m. 17 and therefore depicts mm. 14–21 as a single phrase. As a preliminary investigation of this particular reading, a single harmonic/melodic feature is called into question: does m. 21 mark a PAC in V or a tonicized HC in I? Perhaps this question highlights an evident difficulty when pairing Caplinian form-function analysis with a Schenkerian approach. Whereas a Caplinian approach to form-function analysis privileges foreground events, especially with respect to local harmonic progressions, a Schenkerian approach to form and voice-leading analysis emphasizes a combination of fore-, middle-, and background elements. In other words, and with respect to “Ach weh mir unglückhaften Mann,” whether one analyzes m. 21 as a PAC in V or a tonicized HC in I makes quite a difference in one’s formal reading of this passage. If analyzed as a PAC in V, the reading of the internal melodic IAC (m. 17) distinguishes this excerpt as a period; if read as the only cadence in the excerpt (a tonicized HC in I, m. 21), the question of whether mm. 14–21 comprise a single, compound antecedent phrase can be raised. From a Caplinian perspective, the apparent cadential progression in V (mm. 21–21) marks the completion of a periodic structure—a modulating one, to be sure. From a Schenkerian perspective, which relinquishes apparent “modulations” to mere
tonicizations of particular Stufen, the arrival at V in m. 21 can be regarded as a tonicized HC. While both readings have their merits in terms of one’s scope and zoom, the readings—especially a Schenkerian-based reading—demand an interpretation of the music that follows this particular passage.

If we assume, for now, that m. 21 marks a tonicized HC in I, the music that follows m. 21 may be regarded as some kind of consequent or continuation phrase. On one hand, if the music that follows suggests a parallel structure to mm. 14–21, ending with a stronger cadence than a tonicized HC in I, then a large-scale periodic structure would be evident. On the other hand, if the music that follows suggests continuation function (as per Caplin’s Hybrid 1: antecedent + continuation⁵), then a large-scale hybrid theme exists. However, the passage in mm. 22ff. neither indicates a consequent phrase nor a continuation; therefore, the ultimate formal and musical outcome does not conform to one of these models (Figure 3.4). In this case, the excerpt I present here (mm. 14–21) may be regarded as a “lone antecedent” phrase, which I address in more detail in following subsections of this chapter.⁶ To suggest an antecedent phrase does not necessarily mean that one must expect a consequent phrase. As Caplin has pointed out, Classical composers varied the antecedent-consequent relationship (according to his Hybrids 1, 2, and—to a lesser extent—4), thus expanding the nature and ultimate outcome of apparent antecedent phrases.

A third and final reading of this excerpt aligns with Caplin’s Hybrid 4 design: compound basic idea + consequent.⁷ This reading recognizes the textual break in m. 17 as the completion of a compound basic idea; however, it is extremely important to note—as per the Hybrid 4 model—that the end of the compound basic idea cannot, in this case, be punctuated by a cadence. To me, however, the reading of a Caplinian Hybrid 4 here does not completely account for aspects of the

---

⁵ Caplin, Classical Form, 59–63.
⁶ Refer to pp. 114–118.
⁷ Ibid., 61–63.
Figure 3.4. “Ach weh unglückhaften Mann,” Op. 21, No. 4, mm. 19–29; Form Overlay.
organization of the poetry. While the underlying harmonic structure might suggest the lack of a cadence in m. 17, the poetry—as addressed above—indicates the completion of a musical unit.

Perhaps the differentiation of strict harmonic cadences and loosely defined melodic/textual cadences is just a hallmark of texted music, which is not easily mapped from instrumental to texted music. As is part and parcel of texted music, the poetry is integral to one’s musical analyses of such songs: the poetry introduces a layer of analytical specificity not included in the instrumental-music repertoire.


“Mit deinen blauen Augen” (“With Your Blue Eyes”), Op. 56, No. 4 (1903–1906), is the first example presented in this dissertation where an entire song comprises a single theme-type. This song exhibits one statement of a Straussian hybrid period structure (hybrid period, hereafter). As a brief review, I define hybrid periods based on their antecedent + hybrid consequent design. The antecedent phrase of this song follows closely the Classical antecedent paradigm; however, the hybrid consequent phrase takes on an expanded sentence design. It is important to recall that in hybrid periods, the hybrid consequent phrase begins by referencing—though sometimes loosely—the basic idea of the antecedent phrase. In this way, the hybrid consequent fulfils its Classical rhetorical effect (and partially parallel construction) by suggesting the starting over of the local form in order to close at the end of the consequent what was left open at the end of the antecedent. To be sure, the cadential hierarchy of Classical periods is preserved in the hybrid period model.

---

8 Stephen Rodgers addressed this issue in some of Fanny Hensel’s songs in his keynote address, “Fanny Hensel’s Open Endings: Closure in her Songs,” at the Florida State University Music Theory Society’s 36th Annual Music Theory Forum (January 19, 2019). In his presentation, Rodgers discussed how linear progressions that are usually identified and understood as being involved in tonic prolongation sometimes stand in for cadences when a functional cadential progression is absent. In describing these moments, he designated their function as rhetorical gestures that support just one of the many ways a composer—like Hensel—conveys the affect of poetry through instrumental accompaniment.

9 Note that this is different from the analyses included in Chapter 4, where I analyze multiple statements of a particular form across the span of a single piece (i.e. three Hybrid 3s in “Zueignung”).
From its outset, “Mit deinen blauen Augen” features elaborations of the Classical-model periodic design. Its antecedent phrase, for example, doubles the standard 2-bar basic idea + 2-bar contrasting idea configuration. Rather than settling on a weak cadence after a 4-bar antecedent, Strauss repeats the compound basic idea, which doubles the span of the antecedent phrase (Figure 3.5). Notice the antecedent’s internal repetition in mm. 1–4 and 5–8: while the second compound basic idea (mm. 5–8) is not identical to the first compound basic idea (mm. 1–4), their similarities can be seen especially well in their nearly analogous rhythmic content (save for the second eighth note in m. 1 as it corresponds to the sixteenth notes in m. 5 in the same metric location). Still, both compound basic ideas prolong tonic harmony, trace an arpeggiation through the tonic triad, and, at a deeper structural level, prolong the Kopfton (3, A4) until the half cadence in m. 8 (see my voice-leading sketch in Figure 3.6).

As mentioned above, a feature of the hybrid period is that the beginning of the hybrid consequent phrase must reference the beginning of the antecedent phrase. In this song, an expanded sentence comprises the hybrid consequent phrase, whose presentation phrase is similar to the compound basic idea and its repetition in the antecedent. Specifically, the rhythmic character of the basic idea in mm. 12–13 is identical to mm. 1–2; similarly, the basic idea also exhibits tonic prolongation, outlining especially an arpeggiation of ⁵ and ¹. This basic idea (mm. 12–13) is repeated in mm. 14–15, marking a change in the formal outcome of the hybrid consequent phrase—that is, where the hybrid consequent phrase is heard as a sentence rather than a true consequent or perhaps even a hybrid sentence. Therefore, repetition of the basic idea not only has formal consequences, but dramatic and harmonic consequences, too. Notice in m. 15 that the end of the second basic idea leads the singer and pianist to the distant harmonic region of F# major (or G♭ major, enharmonically, as bII in the home key of F major). At this point in the hybrid consequent phrase’s structure, the chromatic turn toward F# major distances it from the antecedent in terms of its
Figure 3.5. “Mit deinen blauen Augen,” Op. 56, No. 4, mm. 1–26; Form Overlay.
Figure 3.5 – continued
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Figure 3.5 – continued
(nearly) parallel construction, and it also highlights a dramatic turn in the poetry (which I address in more detail below).

The melodic-motivic content within this local F♯-major passage (mm. 15–19) portrays continuation function: two 2-bar fragments (mm. 16–17 and 18–19) elaborate through foreground decoration the arpeggiation, stepwise melody (inverted in these measures), and triplet figures (rhythmically augmented in these measures) found in the preceding basic ideas. From a middleground perspective, these fragments prolong an incomplete upper-neighbor tone A♯4 through a covering upper-third C♯5 (Figure 3.6). The melodic fragments progress through a functional cycle in F♯ major (VI–V–I), where a natural seventh is added to the F♯-major chord (m. 19), transforming it from an enharmonic ♭II to ♭II₇, which—as per its enharmonic reinterpretation—progresses to the dominant of the home key. This curious harmonic parenthesis in F♯ major enlarges the hybrid consequent phrase by way of expanded sentential proportions, specifically within the continuation phrase. As mentioned in Chapters 1 and 2, not only is the
continuation phrase of a sentence or Hybrid 3 the most likely location for phrase expansion, but the consequent of a period or hybrid period structure is similarly the most likely location for this kind of effusiveness.

Before discussing the poetry, I would like to discuss how Strauss achieves a sense of structural and melodic-motivic unity in this hybrid form: these features are seen most clearly in Figure 3.6. Though the overall form comprises two separate theme-types (antecedent + hybrid consequent, composed as an expanded sentence), the melodic profile of these two units is quite similar. First, the primary melodic emphasis of the antecedent phrase is placed on the Kopfton (3, A4); the hybrid consequent phrase also achieves and prolongs the Kopfton, but in a slightly different way. Specifically, an arpeggiated ascent 5–1–3 (C4–F4–A4) in the hybrid consequent phrase shows a more elaborate trajectory of acquiring the Kopfton than the immediate arpeggiation of a sixth at the beginning of the antecedent phrase. Second, the hybrid consequent phrase’s emphasis on C₅ in F major and C#₅ in F# major not only connects internally the melodic-motivic content of each phrase, but the prolonged C#₅, in particular, recalls externally the emphasis on C₅ in the antecedent phrase. Both the C₅ and C#₅ appear about five measures into their respective phrases, in addition to being placed in the same octave and embellishing by an upper third the underlying structural tone (A₄ in F major—the Kopfton, and A#₄ in F# major—the incomplete neighbor tone). Third, and finally, in addition to these structural and melodic-motivic similarities, the rhythmic content of the antecedent and hybrid consequent phrases share many things in common, such as the rhythmic profile of subphrases, the emphasis on triplet figures, and the elaboration of these features, especially in the hybrid consequent. In sum, this song demonstrates how Strauss creates a periodic design through a relatively traditional antecedent phrase and a hybrid consequent phrase, which takes on the form of an expanded sentence. In so doing, and as not to make the antecedent and hybrid consequent
phrases feel disparate, he integrates a number of features that link musical similarity with formal dissimilarity.

Strauss’s setting of the poetry in this song resembles quite clearly the poetic structure.

Mit deinen blauen Augen
Heinrich Heine

Mit deinen blauen Augen
Sichst du mich lieblich an,
Da ward mir so träumend zu Sinne,
Daß ich nicht sprechen kann.

An deinen blauen Augen
Gedenk’ ich allerwärts:
Ein Meer von blauen Gedanken
Ergießt sich über mein Herz.

With Your Blue Eyes

With your blue eyes
You look at me lovingly,
Then my senses grow so dreamy
That I cannot speak.

Of your blue eyes
I am reminded everywhere:
A sea of blue thoughts
Pours forth over my heart.\textsuperscript{10}

The poem comprises two stanzas: Strauss sets the first as the antecedent phrase and the second as the hybrid consequent phrase. Unlike some of the other poems we have already examined, lines 2 and 4 of each stanza of this poem are much more closely related as rhyming pairs than are lines 1 and 3. Stanza 1 divides more evenly than stanza 2 into two distinct units based on the lack of an end-rhyme to group lines 1 and 3 together; rather, the strong end-rhymes of lines 2 and 4, “an” and “kann,” highlight this distinction of stanza 1 comprising two individual units (which relate to the compound basic idea and its repetition, respectively, in the antecedent phrase). Conversely, then, stanza 2 seems generally more continuous than stanza 1, especially in its second half. There is an enjambment in stanza 2, which fuses lines 3 and 4, and, accordingly, these lines correspond with the continuation phrase of the expanded sentence (which comprises in total the hybrid consequent phrase). In light of stanza 2 being more poetically continuous than stanza 1, Strauss’s construction of this hybrid period reflects well the poetic structure and its rhyme scheme.

\textsuperscript{10} Translation mine.
Let us return to the correspondence of the poetry with the chromatic F♯-major passage. To be precise, the introduction of this chromatic region begins with the word “allerwärts”/“everywhere,” where the F♯\textsuperscript{5} chord progresses to the F♯\textsuperscript{4} chord (mm. 14–15). At this point in the poem, the speaker changes affect from seemingly literal comments on their lover’s blue eyes to the metaphorical representation of “Ein Meer von blauen Gedanken”/“a sea of blue thoughts.” The change in the speaker’s tone and representation of “a blue sea” pairs with the underlying “purple patch” chromatic (and formal) parenthesis. As the speaker revels in their thoughts of the “blue sea,” mesmerized by the lover of whom they speak, the music, too, is suspended through chromatic insertion and harmonic elongation. While I have addressed above the specific chromatic impact of this passage, I would also note that the formal consequence of the lofty, dream-like, “blue sea” thoughts elicits a sense of timelessness—as one experiences in dreams—and expands the continuation nearly twice as long as it “should be.”

Contrary to the Classical model, the continuation phrase of this expanded sentence features 2-bar rather than 1-bar melodic-motivic fragments. The 2-bar fragments are particularly noticeable in the continuation phrase since the presentation phrase divided so clearly into a normative 2-bar + 2-bar configuration. Each of the continuation phrase’s fragments comprise two measures, but they accomplish this span by way of a decrease in rhythmic activity on the music’s surface. Specifically, the emphasis on quarter notes, dotted-quarter notes, and half notes greatly contrasts the eighth-note- and sixteenth-note-triplet-saturated rhythmic profile of the presentation phrase. In other words, rather than the continuation phrase increasing the surface energy of the music with respect to the presentation phrase (as is customary), the opposite happens in this passage. The stretching-out of the continuation phrase not only causes an internal phrase expansion by three measures, but it also successfully generates the timelessness and vastness of having become lost in the “sea of blue thoughts” depicted in the poem.
The final line of the poem (“ergießt sich über mein Herz”/“pours forth over my heart”) returns the speaker’s tone to a physical, tangible experience: from thoughts and imagination to their feeling in the heart. Strauss marks this return to the physical and the tangible with a return to the home key of the song, perhaps conveying that the poem’s speaker need not rely only on the imaginary; rather, they can rely and trust in the present reality of their lover.


“Die Zeitlose” (“The Meadow Saffron”), Op. 10, No. 7 (1882–1883), is an example of a Straussian Hybrid Period. As a whole, the song comprises only two formal units: antecedent (mm. 1–4) + dissolving consequent (mm. 5–27, Figure 3.7). In this way, like “Mit deinen blauen Augen,” the song itself is a single theme-type, though it is lopsided with respect to its greatly expanded consequent phrase. However, as it turns out, the disproportionality of the antecedent and consequent is not the only peculiarity this song exhibits. In terms of the song’s harmonic plan, there is an overall shift in modality—from G major to G minor—a feature not seen in many of Strauss’s songs. This shift parallels and highlights the change in poetic affect between the first and second stanzas, marking an important form-functional turning point in the consequent phrase.

The poetry describes the beauty of the meadow saffron, to which the song’s title refers.

Die Zeitlose
Hermann von Gilm

Auf Frisch gemähtem Weideplatz
steht einsam die Zeitlose,
den Leib von einer Lilie,
die Farb’ von einer Rose:
doch es ist Gift, was aus dem Kelch,
dem reinen, blinkt so rötlich
die letzte Blum’, die letzte Lieb’
sind beiden schön, doch tödlich.

The Meadow Saffron

Upon a freshly mown pasture
stands a solitary meadow saffron,
its body that of a lily,
its color that of a rose:
yet it is poison that glints from the chalice,
pure and red –
the last flower – the last love –
both are fair, yet both are deadly.11

11 Translation mine.
The first stanza likens the meadow saffron to a lily and a rose, painting a vivid scene of a freshly mown pasture. However, the second stanza warns against the deceptive beauty of the meadow saffron, reminding us that its charm is enticing yet poisonous, alluring yet deadly. According, at the beginning of the second stanza (mm. 9–12), the stable harmonic underpinnings that accompany the first stanza (mm. 1–8) begin to give way, signaled by a chain of 7–6 suspensions over fully diminished-seventh chords (Figure 3.7). This also marks the shift in modality from G major to G minor. From m. 9 through the end of the song, Strauss uses a harmonic palette that is far less stable than the chords accompanying the voice through m. 8. Notice specifically Strauss’s integration of fully diminished-seventh chords in mm. 9–12, 16, 20–21, and 24–26 (specifically over a tonic pedal in these last three measures): in addition to these dissonant chords, Strauss also prolongs the dissonant cadential six-four (mm. 17–23) by way of a parenthetical Neapolitan triad and #IV7 (mm. 18 and 21, respectively). The extravagance of these dissonant chords creates tension as the song reaches its final cadence. Even the cadence (m. 24) exhibits a certain kind of tension by way of the fully diminished-seventh chords over the tonic pedal, which—with the final melodic tone (♯5, D4, m. 26–27)—distort the sense of completeness and finality at the end of the song. The darkness created by the minor mode, dissonant chords, and angular melodic line (especially in mm. 17–22) invokes the darkness of the poetry’s second stanza and emphasizes the musical disjunction created by two different poetic affects. With this overview of the song’s harmonic underpinnings and its relation to the poetry, let us return to a closer examination of the song’s formal structure.

The first four measures of “Die Zeitlose” comprise an antecedent phrase (b.i. + c.i.), ending with an imperfect authentic cadence in the home key (refer again for Figure 3.7). The antecedent is unusual in terms of its harmonic profile. The song begins with a first-inversion tonic triad, which imparts some kind of medial function, rather than initiation function. The first-inversion tonic triad
Figure 3.7. “Die Zeitlose,” Op. 10, No. 7, mm. 1–27; Form Overlay.
cycles through a functional cadential progression, arriving at an imperfect authentic cadence in m. 4. As such, the antecedent, whose formal function by definition is initiatory, begins with an auxiliary cadence/expanded cadential progression, whose formal function by definition is conclusory. At once the beginning of the song is supported by a harmonic progression that could have been taken from the end of the song, obscuring initiation function and calling into question whether or not the song has properly “begun.”

From a voice-leading perspective, the auxiliary cadence ultimately captures the song’s primary tone (3; B4, m. 4; Figure 3.8). This particular melodic note is also important for establishing the imperfect authentic cadence that—with the basic and contrasting ideas in mm. 1–4—grants these first four measures antecedent function. Like the antecedent phrase, the consequent phrase (mm. 5–8) begins on a first-inversion tonic chord. This non-root-position phrase beginning poses an issue similar to the one in the antecedent: does the first-inversion tonic chord create true initiation function? Regardless of whether this song poses any initiation function in its phrases, the analogous first-inversion tonic beginning of both the antecedent and consequent phrases links them together.
Figure 3.8. “Die Zeitlose,” Op. 10, No. 7, mm. 1–27; Voice-Leading Sketch.
harmonically and aesthetically in a way that remains in dialogue with Caplin’s description of the Classical-model period.

The two phrases are also paired by the underlying melodic content in their basic and contrasting ideas. The downward arpeggio D⁵–B⁴–G⁴ in the antecedent’s basic idea is inverted and rearranged to B⁴–D⁵–G⁵ in the consequent phrase (see the ascending gesture in mm. 5–downbeat of 6). The contrasting idea in the antecedent is more abstractly related to the repetition of the basic idea in the consequent phrase. The appearance of a basic idea and its repetition in the consequent phrase is the first sign of the consequent’s ultimate dissolution. By definition, a consequent phrase should repeat the basic and contrasting ideas of the antecedent phrase, adjusting the melodic aspect of the contrasting idea in some way in order to generate a strong, conclusive cadence.¹² The repetition of the basic idea in the consequent phrase (mm. 7–8) retains characteristics of both the immediately preceding basic idea (mm. 5–6) and the antecedent phrase’s contrasting idea (mm. 3–4). Like the immediately preceding basic idea, its repetition in the consequent phrase possesses the same ascent from B⁴ to G⁵; like the antecedent’s contrasting idea, the repetition of the basic idea in the consequent phrase concludes with the primary tone, but it is altered from B⁴ to B♭⁴ as the song’s modality begins to shift.

In all, the formal layout of the consequent phrase must be reexamined in light of its melodic-motivic design. Plainly, the consequent begins to dissolve as mm. 7–8 reveal that the antecedent phrase’s contrasting idea is not being restated. Furthermore, the lack of a cadence in m. 8 and the existence of extensive musical material well beyond this measure prompts a recalculation of the form-functional units present in mm. 5 and following. First, as discussed above, mm. 5–8 comprise a basic idea and its repetition, providing presentation function. In terms of the underlying harmonic

¹² Caplin, Classical Form, 53.
structure, the presentation overall comprises tonic Stufe prolongation (for which I account in my definition of Straussian expanded sentences). A chromatic boundary tone F₇ is introduced in m. 7, transforming the tonic triad into dominant-seventh quality. The I₇ chord falls to IV₇ in m. 8, whose bass tone (C2) connects the end of the presentation with C3 in m. 9. Second, and also discussed above, mm. 9–27 express continuation function by way of the unstable harmonic palette and motivic fragmentation. In this way, what at first appears to be the consequent phrase dissolves and “becomes” a greatly expanded sentence, spanning twenty-three measures.¹³

Finally, the rhyme scheme of the poetry aids in delineating form-functional and modal boundaries. Notice that lines 2 and 4 of the first stanza rhyme: “Zeitlose”/“Rose.” Strauss places these two words at the end of mm. 4 and 8, which relate to what could have been the ends of the antecedent and consequent phrases. Though the retrospective interpretation of mm. 5ff. shows that a consequent phrase began but dissolved, the poetry’s rhyme scheme marks the end of 4-bar units that function like a period. Furthermore, the completion of the rhyme scheme in the first stanza also marks the completion of this song’s stay in G major. Lastly, a colon punctuates the end of the first stanza, indicating that there is more to come. In a sense, the formal and harmonic departure from periodic structure and G major, respectively, mark a kind of musical colon, as if to convey the meadow saffron’s tantalizing beauty (G major and the expectancy of clear form) that ultimately reveals itself as poisonous and deadly (G minor and the dissolution of formal expectations).


“Schön sind, doch kalt die Himmelssterne” (Beautiful but Cold are the Stars of Heaven”), Op. 19, No. 3 (1888), poses a number of formal curiosities and ambiguities. From a zoomed-out, large-scale perspective, this excerpt presents two distinct musical arrival points—the first in m. 8 and

---

¹³ I graciously adopt the term “becoming” from Janet Schmalfeldt; see Janet Schmalfeldt, In the Process of Becoming: Philosophical and Analytical Perspectives on Form in Early Nineteenth-Century Music (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011).
the second in m. 16 (Figure 3.9). The second of these arrival points (m. 16) is definitively a PAC in
the home key of B♭ major; however, the first arrival point (m. 8) is more nebulous. I believe that
there are two likely possibilities here, both of which consider the melody in the piano part as the
“true” melodic voice. One reading of m. 8 is a tonicized HC in the home key; the other reading is a
PAC in the key of the dominant. Similar to my discussion of a HC in the home key versus a PAC in
the dominant key in “Ach weh mir unglückhaften Mann,” there are formal and voice-leading
consequences when considering either reading. From a strictly form-function and Caplinian
perspective, emphasis is placed on local harmonic progressions and cadences; however, from a
Schenkerian perspective—with an eye for middleground structures—local harmonic progressions
and cadences may be subsidiary, and therefore secondary, to the global harmonic and cadential plan.
In the case of this song, I posit that whether one identifies m. 8 as a HC in the home key or a PAC
in the dominant key, the presence of some kind of cadence divides the form of the excerpt into two
units.

I hear—and therefore analyze—a HC in the home key in m. 8, and I look to the musical
material thereafter to support this reading. First, an examination of mm. 12–16 reveals 2-bar
sequential units: a tonicization of IV in mm. 9–10, followed by a tonicization of II in mm. 11–12.
Note that in the following measures, II is prolonged (mm. 13–14), followed by harmonic motion to
the dominant (m. 15) and then the tonic (m.16, PAC). Notice, then, that the tonicizations of diatonic
triads in mm. 9–12 and the chords thereafter coincide with an overall cadential progression in B♭
major—that is, IV–II–V–I. As such, and for this reason, I observe m. 8 as a HC, followed by a
cadential progression. Additionally, it would seem musically uncommon, if not counterintuitive, to
observe a cadential progression in the home key following a PAC in the key of the dominant.
Specifically with this interpretation in mind, the cadential hierarchy reflects a HC in the home key
(m. 8), followed by a PAC in the home key (m. 16), therefore conveying an overall periodic design.
Figure 3.9. “Schön sind, doch kalt die Himmelssterne,” Op. 19, No. 3, mm. 1–16; Form Overlay.
With this periodic structure in mind, let us investigate the constituent units of the antecedent and consequent phrases. The antecedent phrase (mm. 1–8) is seemingly four measures “too long” with respect to the Classical model. Like “Mit deinen blauen Augen,” an 8-bar antecedent phrase can be viewed as an elaboration of the Classical 4-bar norm. In the case of “Schön sind, doch kalt die Himmelssterne,” the antecedent phrase may be broken into one or two units. If one unit, the antecedent progresses as an 8-bar module (mm. 1–8); if two units, it progresses as two 4-bar modules (mm. 1–4 and 5–8). A single-unit reading considers mm. 1–4 as a basic idea and measures 5–8 as a contrasting idea, which attends specifically to a middleground reading of the harmonic progression—that is, mm. 1–4 being a deeper-level 5–6 motion, rather than accounting for the foreground-level harmonic motion (refer back to Figure 3.9). This reading also accounts for voice-leading features, such as the Anstieg (mm. 1–4) and descent of the Kopfton (3, D5) to 2 (C5) at the HC, each occurring within the basic idea and contrasting idea, respectively (Figure 3.10). However, a two-unit reading acknowledges 2-bar groupings, yielding a basic idea (mm. 1–2) + contrasting idea (mm. 3–4) and its non-literal repetition in mm. 5–8. In comparison to the voice-leading implications of a single-unit reading, this reading follows a fairly analogous reasoning: the first basic idea (mm. 1–2) prolongs 1 (B♭4) of the initial ascent, whereas the first contrasting idea (mm. 3–4) establishes the Kopfton (3); similarly, the second basic idea (mm. 5–6) prolongs 3 by its upper third, whereas the second contrasting idea (mm. 7–8) supports the local descent of the Kopfton to 2 at the interruption. To reiterate, the first compound basic idea is not strictly analogous to the second compound basic idea; however, the roles that each play in establishing the underlying voice leading are equally significant, if not closely related.

In addition to these voice-leading considerations, musical grouping principles are at play here, especially with respect to the poetry. Strauss’s setting of the first two lines of the poem also reflects the reading of a c.b.i. + c.b.i. reading: “Schön sind doch kalt die Himmelssterne, die
Gaben karg, die sie verleih’n” (accented words and syllables underlined).

Schön sind, doch kalt die Himmelssterne
Adolf von Schack

Schön sind, doch kalt die Himmelssterne,
Die Gaben karg, die sie verleih’n;
Für einen deiner Blicke gerne
Hin geb’ ich ihren goldnen Schein!

Beautiful but Cold are the Stars of Heaven

Beautiful but cold are the stars of heaven,
Meager the gifts that they bestow;
For just one of your glances
I’d gladly forego their golden gleam!14

Notice here that—other than the curious setting of “die” rather than “sie” on a strong beat—the pattern of accented words and syllables suggests four subunits within the larger two-unit construction (divided by the comma after “Himmelssterne”). The design of the antecedent phrase of this excerpt, then, is similar to “Mit deinen blauen Augen” in terms of its overall 8-bar, c.b.i. + c.b.i. configuration, though more loosely melodic-motivically linked. In all, the 2-bar units of the compound basic idea and its repetition reflect closely the characteristic composition of Classical compound basic ideas—that is, compound basic ideas comprise 2-bar + 2-bar units rather than 4-bar + 4-bar units.

14 Translation by Richard Stokes.
The c.b.i. + c.b.i. design of the antecedent phrase spans eight measures, supporting the first two lines of the single stanza of poetry. In order to balance the span of the antecedent phrase, Strauss—as mentioned above—composes an 8-bar cadential response. In terms of the overall form, then, this excerpt from “Schön sind, doch kalt die Himmelssterne” most closely resembles Caplin’s Hybrid 2, which is characterized by antecedent + cadential. Here, the span of the cadential phrase balances the elaborated and expanded antecedent phrase—that is, the antecedent is expanded to an 8-bar unit, and so too is the cadential unit expanded to eight measures. As such, the overall form of this excerpt is a Straussian Hybrid Period, though its manifestation is different from that of “Mit deinen blauen Augen” and “Die Zeitlose.”


The first stanza of “Das Bächlein” (“The Brook”), Op. 88, No. 1 (1933), exhibits a curious form related to the lone antecedent (mm. 1–14, Figure 3.11). The song begins with a two-measure piano introduction that represents a little brook meandering through the forest, to which the song’s title refers. The voice enters in m. 3, beginning a normative 4-bar antecedent phrase with the configuration: basic idea (mm. 3–4) + contrasting idea (mm. 5–6), ending with a half cadence in the home key. What follows is difficult to decipher. Let us look first at the poetry of the opening stanza as one way of defining formal boundaries in the music.

Das Bächlein
Johann Wolfgang von Goethe

Du Bächlein, silberhell und klar,
du eilst vorüber immerdar,
Am Ufer steh’ ich, sinn’ und sinn’,
Wo kommst du her? Wo gehst du hin?

You brook, bright silver and clear,
you hurry past forever;
I stand on the bank, pondering and pondering,
Whence did you come? Where did you go?16

The Little Brook

15 Mark Richards has colloquially referred to this as the “cadential period.”
16 Translation mine.
Figure 3.11. “Das Bächlein,” Op. 88, No. 1, mm. 1–18; Form Overlay.
The first stanza ends with the two questions that correspond with mm. 11–14: “Wo kommst du her? Wo gehst du hin?” (“Whence did you come? Where did you go?”). If we regard the end of the first stanza as defining the end of the first formal region, there is a misalignment of poetry, form, and harmony. In other words, there is no cadence at or near m. 14, and the locally tonicized subdominant chord in mm. 13–14 functions only as the predominant in F major (not as a cadence point), progressing promptly to $V_\frac{7}{5}$ in m. 15.
If we examine carefully the formal structure of mm. 7–14, we can make sense of it as beginning a sentence structure whose continuation phrase does not cadence. Specifically, mm. 7–8 comprise a 2-bar basic idea that is repeated literally in mm. 9–10. The following four measures (mm. 11–14) comprise a continuation phrase that ultimately dissolves after m. 14. The continuation phrase begins with the expected rhetoric: in mm. 11–12, stepwise ascending-third gestures function as fragments on the music’s surface while the harmonic rhythm increases. The fragments in mm. 11–12 derive from foreground and middleground ascending and descending thirds in the antecedent phrase (Figure 3.12; stepwise ascending-third gestures marked by “x”s on the voice-leading sketch). Furthermore, the ascending-third gestures possess the possibility to distort the listener’s sense of hypermeter in mm. 11–12. As you will see from my analysis in Figure 3.11, m. 11 comprises the tonicization of II and establishes a sequential pattern. This pattern returns in mm. 12–13, tonicizing IV; however, the harmonic rhythm in mm. 12–13 slows by half—in other words, m. 11 contains the entire tonicization of II, whereas the tonicization of IV spans two measures. Notice that the melody is coordinated with this decreased harmonic rhythm. Furthermore, once the subdominant harmony is achieved in m. 14, it is prolonged through m. 15. In terms of my phrase counts, then, I elect to label m. 11 as bar 5 and mm. 12–14 as bar 6. As such, this continuation phrase is still left open-ended; however, for reasons I address below, the arrival at the subdominant chord in m. 14 maintains a sense of “ending,” mainly by way of the poetry.

While the antecedent phrase (mm. 3–6) and the unfinished sentence (mm. 7–14) are related through their shared ascending and descending third motives (just discussed), they do not at first appear to be two related formal units, and their cohesion as a period goes against the parameters set forth by Caplin. To be sure, the music that ensues in mm. 7–14 renders mm. 3–6 a lone antecedent phrase. Recall that for Caplin a consequent phrase must repeat the antecedent but modify it in some way to conclude with a strong cadence. While mm. 7–14 are not a repetition of the antecedent
phrase, they are not entirely unrelated to it; in fact, the two phrases, though not a period, connect by an underlying fourth-progression from the opening tonic chord to the $V_\frac{6}{5}$ in m. 15 (Figure 3.12; see the beam under the treble staff).

With this melodically fluent line underlying mm. 1–15 in mind, I conclude by offering one other way in which these two phrases cohere. Recall that the first fourteen measures of this song set the poetry’s first stanza, and the stanza rhyming couplets: lines 1 & 2 and 3 & 4. The lone antecedent phrase aligns well with the poetry, creating a closed unit for lines 1 and 2 poetically (by rhyme), harmonically (by the half cadence in m. 6), melodically (by the local descent to $\hat{2}$ at the half cadence), and, therefore, formally. While the unfinished sentence does not exhibit the harmonic, melodic, and formal closure that the antecedent does, the poetry gives great strength to a kind of rhetorical closure that is not found in the music. In other words, while many musical factors point toward open-endedness in mm. 12–14, the poetry’s rhyming couplets create a formal boundary—albeit a loose one—in these measures. This is just another example of the ways in which Strauss entwines musical and textual features to both create and make sense of formal ambiguities.
CHAPTER 4

EXPRESSIONS OF CLASSICAL-MODEL SENTENCES AND THEIR ELABORATIONS THROUGH FULL-SONG ANALYSES


In order to investigate Strauss’s elaborations of Classical-model sentences through full-song analyses, I begin by drawing attention to Strauss’s famed “Zueignung” (“Dedication”), Op. 10, No. 1 (1882–1883). Beloved by singers and pianists for its soaring melodies and dramatic piano accompaniment, this first song in Op. 10 is more often sung as an encore than an opener. The song comprises three iterations of Hybrid 3 structure, which correspond with the poem’s three stanzas (Figure 4.1).

Zueignung
Hermann von Gilm

Ja, du weißt es, teure Seele,
Daß ich fern von dir mich quäle,
Liebe macht die Herzen krank,
Habe Dank.

Einst hielt ich, der Freiheit Zecher,
Hoch den Amethysten-Becher,
Und du segnetest den Trank,
Habe Dank.

Und beschworst darin die Bösen,
Bis ich, was ich nie gewesen,
Heilig, heilig an’s Herz dir sank,
Habe Dank.

Dedication

Yes, dear soul, you know
That I am in torment far from you,
Love makes the heart sick –
Be thanked.

Once, reveling in freedom,
I held the amethyst cup aloft
And you blessed that draught –
Be thanked.

And you banished the evil spirits,
Until I, as never before,
Holy, sank holy upon your heart –
Be thanked.¹

A defining middleground melodic-motivic feature that governs the first half of each stanza is an arpeggio of the tonic triad: 5–1–3 (G4–C5–E5, labeled “x” in Figure 4.2). This arpeggio connects the basic idea and the contrasting idea, highlighting how Strauss crafts two different-sounding

¹ Translation mine.
Figure 4.1. “Zueignung,” Op. 10, No. 1; Form Overlay.
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musical units on the foreground that share a common middleground structure. We have already seen a similar technique in my analysis of “Wiegenliedchen” (Figures 2.11 and 2.12, pp. 71 and 74, respectively); however, in the case of “Zueignung,” the arpeggios indicate melodic-motivic characteristics within the compound basic idea, rather than as they relate the compound basic idea to the continuation phrase. In this way, my voice-leading analysis aims to demonstrate a closer musical connection between the basic and contrasting ideas in “Zueignung,” therefore indicating an extra
Figure 4.2. “Zueignung,” Op. 10, No. 1; Voice-Leading Sketch of Stanzas 1–3.
layer of musical cohesion that is not accounted for by a formal reading alone.

According to the presence of the melodic-motivic tonic-triad arpeggio, Strauss sets the first half of each stanza nearly identically. Save for a slight harmonic variation on beat 4 of m. 24 (which corresponds with beat 4 of mm. 6 and 15), the compound basic idea of each stanza progresses identically in terms of melody and harmony. Overall, the compound basic idea serves to prolong tonic until it reaches a chromatic boundary tone—either C♯ in V6/3 (mm. 6 and 15), or B♭ in I♭7 (m. 24). In either case, the chromatic boundary marks the end of tonic prolongation in the compound basic idea and initiates a prolongation of the predominant region in the continuation phrase.

The melodic-motivic tonic-triad arpeggio and the harmonic features of the compound basic idea are not the only markers of how Strauss organizes each stanza; rather, he also attends to the structure of the poetry and its internal rhyme scheme. Each stanza of the poem—four lines total—shares a number of similar features. First, each stanza’s rhyme scheme pairs together lines 1 & 2 and 3 & 4. This particular rhyme scheme allows for lines 1 and 2 to act as a pair, each comprising a single unit of the compound basic idea (the basic idea and contrasting idea, respectively). In a similar way, the last two lines of each stanza comprise the continuation phrase. Second, seeing that the last line of each stanza is identical—“habe dank”/“be thanked”—Strauss uses a consistent rhythmic and contour setting of these particular words (dotted-eighth note + sixteenth note + whole or half note; notice the similar ascending contour, too: ascending minor third in stanzas 1 and 2 and ascending major sixth in stanza 3—which is a nod to the tonic-triad arpeggio discussed above). Third, and perhaps more subtle, line 3 of each stanza reveals the speaker’s tireless desire for their lover in the midst of distance, heartache, and misfortune. In some way, the speaker responds in line 3 to the troubles identified in the first two lines, which are descriptive in nature. Strauss sets this particular feature of the poem with local structural events in the voice-leading: the third line of the poem—
which always marks the beginning of the continuation—introduces a local incomplete (stanzas 1 and 3, mm. 7 and 25) or complete (stanza 2, m. 16) neighbor tone (see Figure 4.2 again). The journey taken by this incomplete or complete neighbor tone parallels the journey taken by the two lovers in the poem, according to the speaker. The apparent resolution of any misfortune identified by the speaker—specifically to “be thanked”—also pairs with the resolution of the local incomplete or complete neighbor tone. Subtle as it may be, Strauss’s particular pairing of these local structural events with the succession of the speaker’s thoughts and realizations in each stanza of the poetry highlights yet another aspect of musical and textual congruity in his songs.

A closer look at each statement of “habe Dank” reveals its instability in terms of the local harmony and cadence (or lack thereof) in stanzas 1 and 2, versus its stability and conclusiveness in stanza 3. In stanzas 1 and 2, Strauss sets “habe Dank” as a minor third from G⁴ to B♭⁴ (mm. 9–10 and 18, respectively) with a characteristic rhythmic profile (as mentioned above). Though the notes remain the same in these two statements, the local underlying harmony varies. In stanza 1, these words participate in the cadential progression V–I; however, the addition of B♭ transforms the tonic triad to an altered version with a flattened seventh (m. 10). Therefore, this chromatic transformation weakens the PAC at the end of the first stanza, paralleling the speaker’s uncertainty and sadness reflected by the distance from their lover, as conveyed in the poem.

The second statement of “habe Dank” (at the end of the second stanza, m. 18) is less clear than its appearance at the end of the first stanza. First, and foremost, this particular iteration does not participate in a cadence; rather, the B♭⁴ functions as a neighbor tone to an inner-voice A⁴, which

---

² In terms of Strauss’s many homages to the Classical style, this particular pattern of 1–♭7–6–♭7–1 over a tonic pedal is what Robert Gjerdingen calls “The Quiescenza,” which is common in Galant music. Perhaps this subtlety is appreciated best when paired with the melodic-motivic, harmonic, formal, and textual features rather than index the Classical style of this particular song. Specifically, the two measures of piano interlude, which serve to reset the tonic triad, prevent the singer from wandering too far away from the home key. See Robert O. Gjerdingen, *Music in the Galant Style* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2007), 181–195.
is superposed an octave higher as the piano provides a 2-bar interlude between stanzas 2 and 3. This A5 not only marks a local highpoint in the music, but it also anticipates in, by way of reaching-over, the song’s climax in m. 25. Second, recall that this statement of “habe Dank” at the end of stanza 2 maintains an identical rhythmic profile as the other two statements of the same text; however, its metric placement is shifted to the right by one beat. This shift is likely the result of the speaker’s continued uncertainty and Strauss’s way of moving the music forward toward the final stanza. In either case, the piano enters to correct the rhythmic displacement and ease the singer into the final stanza through the recapturing of the singer’s register by descending a tenth from A5 to F4 (where F4 is still the local neighbor tone transferred in register from F5), as well as the addition of anticipatory textural triplets on beats 3 and 4 of m. 20.

The formal and harmonic technicalities of this stanza—especially Strauss’s setting of this particular “habe Dank”—reveal a great deal about a turning point in the story. We read in this stanza that the poem’s speaker holds up the chalice of freedom, which was blessed by their lover when the two fell in love. In so doing, the speaker loses their freedom, but the “poison” of selfishness has been excised by the unselfish offering of love to the beloved. The evasion of cadence, then, is the harmonic turning point that propels the music into the third stanza, in which we learn how the beloved blessed the previously poisonous draught of “selfish freedom.”

The final statement of “habe Dank” (mm. 28–29) is the most definitive and conclusive, which befits a poem whose speaker is considerably more confident at the end than at the beginning. In this instance, Strauss’s setting of these two words clarifies some of the ambiguities presented in earlier statements. First, the metric profile is restored to that of the first statement in the first stanza: here, “Dank” is placed on the downbeat of the penultimate measure, therefore emphasizing the accented word of the pair “habe Dank.” Second, and similar to the end of the second stanza, this statement of “habe Dank” also features a superposition of an inner voice (now by ascending sixth
from G4 to E5). As mentioned above, this particular motion from G4 to E5 intervalically summarizes the outer limits of the motivic tonic-triad arpeggio in the compound basic idea. Furthermore, through this inner-voice superposition, the singer defies their participation in tracing the song’s fundamental line, leaving 2 (D5) and 1 (C5) of the Urlinie for the piano. The singer’s overshooting of 1 portrays their confidence—if not over-confidence—and exuberance in the love shared with their lover. In this way, the final “habe Dank” clarifies and confirms the story being told throughout the poem, in addition to the ways in which the voice and piano lines interact in this song to accomplish the same goal.

Finally, this song features another conflict between form and voice leading, specifically the curious oscillation between a six-four voice-leading chord in the song’s opening two bars—a gesture that is reinterpreted and clarified throughout the song. Taken literally, the Bs in the piano bassline in mm. 1–2 function as lower-neighbor tones to C. As the singer enters in m. 3, this oscillation continues; however, in m. 3, B is reinterpreted as a passing tone between C and A, rather than as a third iteration of a lower-neighbor tone to C. Through this gesture, Strauss portrays in both the 2-bar introduction and at the singer’s entrance the sense of a hesitant, uneasy opening to this song, where the voice leading and form seem to misalign. Surely we have seen other songs in previous chapters that begin either with auxiliary progressions or off-tonic; like them, “Zueignung” stands as no exception to the rule that Strauss uses these kinds of form and voice leading misalignments to highlight and convey particular aspects of the poetry. In this song, Strauss immediately creates a sense of the singer’s uncertainty through stanzas 1 and 2 (notice that B in the bass functions again as a passing tone at the beginning of stanza 2, m. 12). As I proposed in my analysis of stanza 3 through the lens of how Strauss sets “habe Dank” at the conclusion of the song and therefore emphasizes the singer’s change from uncertainty to confidence, so too does he hint at these aspects of stanza 3 from its very beginning (m. 21). As a means of prolonging the neighbor tone F5 in mm. 16–20,
Strauss introduces F5 in a consonant state over the supertonic harmony. As F5 is prolonged and transferred down by octave to F4, there is a change of bass to V7, which renders the F as dissonant (through a 10–7 pattern across these measures). By way of the voice leading, then, stanza 3 cannot begin in the same way as stanzas 1 and 2. In other words, Strauss was unable to use a C-major triad on beat 4 of m. 20; a C-major triad would not have supported the F neighbor tone successfully. As a result, Strauss displaces the C-major triad by one beat, situating it on the downbeat of m. 21, followed by the passing bass B1 on beat 2 and A1 on beat 3. These small details change the rhetorical profile of stanza 3’s beginning—that is, stanza 3 begins with a definitive root-position tonic triad and exhibits an exact alignment of form and voice leading. To reiterate, this alignment at the beginning of stanza 3 pairs with its triumphant setting of “habe Dank” at its end in order to convey that the poetry—and therefore the song—concludes with a positive, assured affect.


“Allerseelen,” Op. 10, No. 8 (1882–1883), like “Die Zeitlose” from the same Opus (see Figures 3.7 and 3.8, pp. 105–107, respectively), comprises a single theme-type, which spans the entire song. Whereas “Die Zeitlose” exhibits a Hybrid Period design, “Allerseelen” exhibits a small ternary design comprising hybrid and expanded sentences in each of its three sections. Caplin describes the small ternary theme-type as consisting of three main sections, which express the formal functions of exposition (A), contrasting middle (B), and recapitulation (A’). The exposition is constructed as a tight-knit theme, most often a period but also possibly a sentence, hybrid, or even a nonconventional design. […] The contrasting middle section achieves its sense of contrast primarily by harmonic and phrase-structural means and only secondarily by melodic-motivic means. […] The phrase structure of the B section is looser and usually less conventional in its thematic design than the preceding A section is. […] The recapitulation represents a return, either complete or partial, of the exposition. The section must begin with the basic idea from the exposition and close in the home key with a perfect authentic cadence.³

³ Caplin, Classical Form, 71.
The overall poetic structure of “Allerseelen” relates to its musical formal structure; Strauss sets each of the poem’s three stanzas as a distinct section, fusing the three-stanza poetic design with the tripartite musical form.

### Allerseelen

_Hermann von Gilm_

Stell auf den Tisch die duftenden Reseden,  
Die letzten roten Astern trag herbei,  
Und laß uns wieder von der Liebe reden,  
Wie einst im Mai.

Gib mir die Hand, daß ich sie heimlich drücke,  
Und wenn man’s sieht, mir ist es einerlei,  
Gib mir nur einen deiner süßen Blicke,  
Wie einst im Mai.

Es blüht und duftet heut auf jedem Grabe,  
Ein Tag im Jahr ist ja den Toten frei,  
Komm am mein Herz, daß ich dich wieder habe,  
Wie einst im Mai.

---

### All Souls’ Day

Set on the table the fragrant mignonettes,  
Bring in the last red asters,  
And let us talk of love again  
As once in May.

Give me your hand to press in secret,  
And if people see, I do not care,  
Give me but one of your sweet glances  
As once in May.

Each grave today has flowers and is fragrant,  
One day each year is devoted to the dead;  
Come to my heart and so be mine again,  
As once in May.

As Matthew BaileyShea has remarked about sentences, there appears also to be an embedded rhetorical effect generated by the small ternary form on two levels. At a global level, the progression through the form tells a musical story: (1) the plot and premise of the story is revealed in A, (2) new information is added to the story in B, and (3) the plot and premise of the story is recalled in A’, where—most importantly—the listener and/or the analyst is able to reconsider, reinterpret, and clarify the story based on the musical information gathered through the progression of the form. In other words, what was stated in A is reconsidered in A’ in a new or more-detailed way, especially after hearing and considering B. At a local level, then, the form may derive a greater sense of rhetorical significance based on the embedded phrase structure in A, B, and A’ (especially if any of the units are set as sentences).

---

4 Translation by Richard Stokes.  
In light of the inherent rhetorical aspects of the small ternary form, I begin my analysis of “Allerseelen” with an examination of the entire poem. At the beginning of the poem it is difficult to determine the person addressed by the poem’s speaker. It is not until the end of the first stanza that one might begin to imply that the speaker of the poem is talking to someone who is not present with them. However, as the poem progresses, the speaker continues to recall and reveal the many fond memories of the time spent with their lover. Through the speaker’s recollection of these memories, stanzas 1 and 3 seem to group together with respect to their references to fragrant flowers and the image of the lovers talking with and seeing each other again. Stanza 2 portrays the physicality and tactility of this reunification—that is, in stanza 2 the speaker desires to press their lover’s hand and receive but one more of their sweet glances. In this way, the separate affects displayed in the poem’s three stanzas also align with the rhetorical aspects of the small ternary form. Furthermore, with the information gathered in stanzas 1 and 2, the reader of the poem and the listener of the song can begin to (re)consider, (re)interpret, and clarify the story in stanza 3. Specifically, it is apparent in stanza 3 that the speaker of the poem is recalling and speaking to the their beloved.

Strauss portrays the story and its clarification through time in a number of beautifully musical ways. If we recall my analysis of the first stanza of “Allerseelen” from Chapter 2 (pp. 76–83), we will remember that there is a misalignment between the piano entrance and the voice entrance (refer back to Figures 2.13 and 2.14, pp. 77 and 81, respectively, and see Figure 4.3 below). The piano and the voice represent the two characters in this poem: the speaker—who is living and portrayed by the piano—and the spirit of the speaker’s lover—portrayed by the singer. With this in

---

6 Please recall that I present a form and voice-leading analysis of the first stanza of “Allerseelen” in Chapter 2 (Figures 2.13 and 2.14, pp. 77 and 81, respectively).
7 I would especially like to thank Douglas Fisher for suggesting to me the analysis of piano-as-living-lover and singer-as-spirit.
Figure 4.3. “Allerseelen,” Op. 10, No. 8; Form Overlay.
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mind, we can begin to paint the picture of the spirit—on All Souls’ Day—returning into the mind of their lover. From my formal analyses, we recall that the contrasting idea (which begins in m. 3) stalls on the supertonic harmony, churning out small motivic fragments of the contrasting idea. It is not until m. 7 that the voice enters in the middle of the stalled contrasting idea with a corrective phrase that joins with and resets the form in the piano accompaniment. We might think of mm. 1–11, then, as the presence of the living lover (the piano, m. 1) who is spoken to and welcomed into the mind of their lover (the voice, m. 7) on the annual day of remembering the deceased. By beat 3 of m. 10, through the downbeat of m. 11, the spirit and their lover are perfectly reunited—this is the first time in the song where the piano and voice are aligned melodically.

From a formal perspective, m. 11 marks the end of the expanded compound basic idea, highlighting the joining together of the spirit and their lover—through melody and harmony—at this phrase juncture. As I have described in Chapter 2, the expanded compound basic idea comprising mm. 1–11 is followed by a 6-bar continuation phrase, leading to a HC in bVII (Db, m. 17). This cadence concludes the A section of the small ternary form. The contrasting middle (B) section of the form spans mm. 18–26, taking an initial turn toward VI and concluding with a dominant-seventh chord in the home key. Whereas the A section exhibits Hybrid Sentence structure, B comprises near-model sentence structure, though more conservative than A in its dimensions. Based on an 8-bar model, B is expanded by a single measure. I identify the expansion in mm. 23–24, where Strauss elongates what could have been a single-bar melodic fragment into two bars. His setting places great emphasis on the text, suspending time for a musical revelry that highlights the desire for “deiner süßen Blicke”/“your sweet glances.” This moment is also marked by the pianissimo indication in the voice and piano. As we have now seen in many of Strauss’s songs,

---

8 The rhythm for “deiner süßen Blicke” could have been four eighth notes followed by two quarter notes—hence, a single bar.
he often introduces phrase expansions in the service of rhetoric and the expression of poetic
meaning, in order to highlight a word or phrase.

The completion of the contrasting middle (B) section also marks the completion of the left
branch of an overall interruption scheme in the voice leading (Figure 4.4). Both the A and B
sections display important structural events that shape not only the inner workings of these two
sections, but anticipate musical events that will gain rhetorical significance in A'. First, A introduces
in m. 1 the Kopfton (3, G5) of the song. The A section also establishes two middleground iterations
of an Ab neighbor tone. The prolonged Ab in mm. 4–10 conveys how the middleground voice
leading stalls as a result of the stalled contrasting idea. Even as the voice facilitates the resetting of
the contrasting idea, the Ab, which was introduced in a consonant state (a 10th above F2, m. 4), is
transformed to a dissonant 7th over B♭2 (m. 10). The Ab returns again as a neighbor tone at the
arrival of the HC in bVII (mm. 16–17). Second, Ab also derives structural importance in the B
section. Here, Ab functions as an apparent neighbor tone to 3 at the interruption in m. 26, whose
structural goal is to prepare the recapitulation (note the “= n.n.” in my voice-leading sketch, Figure
4.4). Therefore, the frequency of Ab in the A and B sections unites the melodic-motivic realm with
the structural realm. In this way, the label “contrasting middle” suits the purposes of the foreground
voice leading; however, the middleground emphasis on Ab links A and B, specifically relating B to
the rest of the song.

As mentioned above, the emphasis on Ab in the A and B sections foreshadows its
significance in A'. In the recapitulation, Ab5 marks the song’s climax, expressed as an incomplete
neighbor tone that falls to the structural 3 (F5, m. 34). Here, the singer exclaims, if not begs, with
*fortissimo* dynamics “daß ich dich wieder habe”/*that I have you again*—an unattainable desire that
the singer only wishes could be fulfilled. The reality of this unfulfillable desire comes alive in the
Figure 4.4. “Allerseelen,” Op. 10, No. 8; Voice-Leading Sketch.
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music just after this climactic moment. Notice in mm. 35–37 the registral plunge—signifying emotional disintegration—in both the piano and voice lines as the singer realizes that they cannot be reunited with their lover. The higher register is hinted at again in mm. 38–39; however, the singer’s attempt to rise toward tonic at the final cadence is thwarted by the drop in register on 7 and 1 (m. 39, beat 4 to m. 40).9

Besides the climax of the song and the culmination of the melodic-motivic A♭ neighbor tone, the recapitulation serves two other functions: first, it clarifies the hybrid form presented in A; second, it clarifies the relationship between form, harmony, and poetry.10 In terms of the form, the recapitulation comprises an expanded Straussian hybrid sentence structure, though, unlike the exposition, the expansion occurs in the continuation phrase rather than in the contrasting idea of the compound basic idea (refer back to my form overlay in Figure 4.3). In particular, the recapitulation’s contrasting idea no longer “stalls” on the supertonic at m. 30, but flows directly into the continuation phrase in m. 31. Hence, in the recapitulation there is no corrective phrase in the voice line; rather, the piano nearly perfectly doubles the voice throughout this final formal section, which highlights the joining of the living lover and the spirit. In addition to clarifying the stalled contrasting idea in the exposition, the continuation phrase in the recapitulation (mm. 31–40) aids in restoring normative 1-bar fragments in its first four measures (mm. 31–34). To be sure, the structure of the continuation phrase does deviate from the Classical model in mm. 35–40: in these measures, the words “wie einst im Mai”/“as once in May” are stated twice, separated by a fragment in the piano (m. 36b–37), which expands the dimensions of the entire phrase. However, as we have now seen in many examples, Strauss most commonly introduces expansion in the continuation phrase of

---

9 Notice also the reference to A♭ (in an inner voice and over a tonic pedal) in the piano postlude (m. 42).
10 As we observed in “Zueignung,” Strauss clarifies curious musical features—such as form, harmony, and voice leading—in the third and final stanza.
sentential structures. The A’ section of “Allerseelen” is no exception. However, even with the expansion in the recapitulation’s continuation phrase, there is still a clarification in structure from a greatly distorted and expanded hybrid sentence in the exposition to a clearer expanded hybrid sentence in the recapitulation.

The clarification of the song’s form in the recapitulation aligns with the clarification of the poetry. Specifically, it is in the third stanza that the reader of the poem can confirm to whom the poem’s speaker has been talking. Furthermore, it is also in the third stanza that the words “wie einst im Mai”/“as once in May,” which appear at the end of each stanza, acquire their deepest and clearest meaning. As mentioned, these words are stated twice in the recapitulation (mm. 35–36 and 38–40). The melodic contour, dynamics, and harmony to which each statement is set illuminates the ultimate outcome of the speaker’s upset. In the first statement (mm. 35–36), the singer (as spirit) continues an unattainable plea to share once again with their lover the many things they enjoyed in the month of May. Strauss conveys this affect through the punctuated onset of the word “wie” after a breathless quarter-note rest on beat 1 of m. 35. Furthermore, the piano continues to double the voice in this first statement as the dominant region is temporarily and very locally prolonged through mm. 35 and 36; however, at a deeper structural level, this apparent dominant is encased within the larger prolongation of the supertonic region (mm. 34–37). The resolution to a cadential dominant is therefore refused and turned back to the supertonic in m. 37, conveying the impossibility of the spirit’s desire for reunification with their beloved. With adamancy and desperation, the spirit begs a final time to be reunited with their beloved. However, the impossibility and ultimate defeat is once again conveyed through the music, this time by the failed ascending line from 5 toward the cadence (mm. 38–40). Strauss also conveys the spirit’s acknowledgement of defeat through the sense of suspension and a return to the ethereal by way of the parenthetical chords that expand the cadential
six-four in these measures (specifically m. 38, beats 3–4; and m. 39, beats 1–3). The living lover’s memory of their beloved remains present in the piano postlude.


My analysis of the first nine measures of “Befreit,” Op. 39, No. 4 (1898) appears in Chapter 2 (Figures 2.1 and 2.2, pp. 41 and 42, respectively). Recall from my earlier analysis that I use the opening measures of “Befreit” to identify a normative sentence structure that is in line with the Classical-model sentence. In all, Strauss uses the first three lines of the poem’s first stanza as the textual basis for this sentence. However, as you will see just below, the poem is considerably longer than the excerpt I show in Chapter 2. In fact, the poem comprises three six-line stanzas. Strauss sets three-line groupings as individual musical sentences—some of which are more expanded and elaborated than others.

*Befreit*  
*Richard Dehmel*

Du wirst nicht weinen. Leise, leise  
wirst du lächeln und wie zur Reise  
geb’ ich dir Blick und Kuß zurück.  
Unsre lieben vier Wände, du hast sie bereitet,  
ich habe dir zur Welt geweitet;  
O Glück!

 Dann wirst du heiß meine Hände fassen  
und wirst mir deine Seele lassen,  
läßt unsern Kindern mich zurück.  
Du schenktest mir dein ganzes Leben,  
ich will es ihnen wieder geben;  
O Glück!

Es wird sehr bald sein, wir wissen’s beide,  
wir haben einander befreit vom Leide,  
so gab’ ich dich der Welt zurück!  
Dann wirst du mir nur noch im Traum erscheinen  
und mich segnen und mit mir weinen;  
O Glück!

*Freed*

You will not weep. Gently, gently  
you will smile; and as before a journey  
I shall return your gaze and kiss.  
You have cared for the room we love!  
I have expanded it for you into a world –  
O joy!

Then ardently you will seize my hands  
and you will leave me your soul,  
leave me to care for our children.  
You gave your whole life to me,  
I shall give it back to them –  
O joy!

It will be very soon, we both know it,  
we have released each other from suffering,  
so I returned you to the world.  
Then you’ll appear to me only in dreams,  
and you will bless me and weep with me –  
O joy!\(^\text{11}\)

\(^{11}\) Translation by Richard Stokes.
Unlike “Zueignung” and “Befreit,” the Classicalness of these sentences—in terms of their musical form—becomes increasingly unclear over the course of the song, which ultimately relates to the story.

As a preliminary formal observation, Strauss uses two distinct musical textures for the two sentences in each stanza: the first sentence features a piano accompaniment of triplet arpeggios or elaborations of these triplet arpeggios that are either (1) increased in intensity as sextuplets or (2) filled in by step to connect the notes of the arpeggio; conversely, the second sentence always features a piano accompaniment that begins with a chorale-like texture of block chords, followed by a passage that breaks the chorale-like texture and integrates many suspensions in the voice and piano lines (see Table 4.1 to compare and contrast these textures).

### Table 4.1 Texture Comparison among “Befreit” Theme-Types in Stanzas 1–3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stanza</th>
<th>Sentence (or Hybrid 3) in Stanza</th>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Texture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1–9</td>
<td>Triplet arpeggios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9–23</td>
<td>Chorale-like block chords and suspensions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24–32</td>
<td>Triplets, sextuplets, and filled-in arpeggios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>34–45</td>
<td>Chorale-like block chords and suspensions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>46–56</td>
<td>Triplet arpeggios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>56–76</td>
<td>Chorale-like block chords and suspensions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While the different sentence structures that set the three strophes of the songs may share some musical features with one another, there is an overall progression from tightly knit to loosely knit construction among these sentences. In general, the sentences in subsequent stanzas exhibit progressively increasing elaborations and distortions of the Classical-model sentence paradigm. These elaborations include phrase expansion, incorrect number of statements of a basic idea, non-normative lengths of melodic-motivic fragments, and interesting harmonic digressions. These
elaborations and their succession throughout the song relate to the freedom—described by the poem’s title—one experiences when escaping the pain, suffering, and hurt of earthly life for the peace and perfection of the afterlife. Put another way, the progression in the music from clarity to obscurity—from adherence to Classical conventions to a freedom from them—parallels the dying beloved’s liberation from the suffering inherent in the mortal realm.

In terms of proceeding with an analysis of this song, there are two routes that one might take. The first route considers the information provided in Table 4.1, which suggests that an analysis of the song might be broken into two units: the first unit would demonstrate how Strauss states model-sentence structure in the first sentence of stanza 1 and then elaborates and distorts this structure in the first sentences of stanzas 2 and 3; the second unit would do the same thing for the second sentences in stanzas 1, 2, and 3. Rather than demonstrating the respective relationships between the first and second sentences in each of the song’s three stanzas, another route might consider the succession of each sentence as the song progresses. This approach privileges the song’s overall voice leading and progression of the story, but fails to offer a tidy one-to-one mapping of Strauss’s elaborations of sentence structures based on analogous passages of music. While both routes have obvious merits and can lead us to the ultimate destination—which is a comprehensive analysis of form, voice leading, and text-setting in “Befreit,” in the remainder of this chapter I choose to hybridize these routes and proceed with one or the other methodology for different sections of music. Specifically, I will use the first route for stanzas 1 and 2—that is, I will compare and contrast the first and second sentences of stanzas 1 and 2, respectively, and consider how they are related in terms of form and voice leading. However, I will follow the second route to account for stanza 3, whose form and voice leading—especially—differs greatly from stanzas 1 and 2. In all I use this hybrid approach to both analytic routes in order to reveal further how the unfolding of
clarity to obscurity is revealed to the listener through Strauss’s text-setting. (A complete form overlay and voice-leading sketch are provided for reference in Figures 4.4 and 4.5.)

On the music’s surface, the first sentence of stanza 1 (mm. 2–9) does not appear to be particularly similar to the first formal unit of stanza 2 (mm. 24–32, which, for now, we can regard as a Hybrid 3). However, elements of the voice leading, accompaniment, and poetry unify these two passages. First, C5 is emphasized in both of these passages. (In fact, the interpretation of C5 varies throughout this song in terms of its relationship to the Kopfton (B4):12 in some cases this C# functions as a complete neighbor tone; in other cases, it functions as an incomplete neighbor tone; and, in still other cases, it functions as a passing tone.) In the first sentences of stanzas 1 and 2, C5 functions as either a complete neighbor tone (stanza 1) or an incomplete neighbor tone (stanza 2). In either case, the emphasis on this C# aids in conveying a sense of unity among these two sentences.

Second, notice also how C5 participates in the connection of 4 (A4) in the Umlinie replica in stanza 2 (mm. 29–30, specifically). In the second stanza, a prominent foreground 4 arises in m. 30, supported by an F#-minor triad. As mentioned just above, this 4 participates in a local descent to 1; however, 4 is absent from the abbreviated descent to 1 in the first sentence of the first stanza, where the descent to tonic spans only a third from the inner-voice G4 to E4 (see the local-level beam beneath the treble voices in mm. 2–9 of Figure 4.5). In this way, the meaning of C5 changes in the second sentence of stanza 2 because of its participation in the connection of 4 to the Umlinie replica.

---

12 An alternative reading of this song’s voice-leading structure acknowledges the acquisition of the Kopfton as an unfolded major sixth from B4 (5) in m. 2 to G#5 (3) in m. 64. On one hand, this reading minimizes the foreground emphasis on, and salience of, B4 (5) throughout the song; however, on the other hand, this reading engages the Schenkerian principle of “obligatory register,” drawing attention to Strauss’s use of two different octaves as initiators of voice-leading motion in this song. Note especially that the upper register to which the orchestra will seemingly resolve (mm. 68–69) is compensated for at the lower octave in m. 70 upon the piano’s arrival at E4. The Coda (mm. 70ff.) therefore compensates for the leap to this lower register, specifically by way of the voice (B4, 5) covering E4 (1) in the orchestra. For additional precedent on unusual delays of the Kopfton, see Heather Platt, “Text-Music Relationships in the Lieder of Johannes Brahms” (PhD diss. City University of New York, 1992).
Figure 4.5. “Befreit,” Op. 39, No. 4; Form Overlay.
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In either case—whether a complete neighbor tone in stanza 1 or an incomplete neighbor tone in stanza 2—this C# is emphasized as a local structural event in each sentence, where 5 still remains in force at the middle- and background levels.

Third, the Hybrid 3 design of this passage is evident at the immediate foreground level; however, the middleground voice leading reveals that rather than a truly distinct contrasting idea comprising mm. 26–27, a basic idea in disguise underlies these measures. Notice in the basic idea (mm. 24–25) the melodic-motivic descending second from D#5 to C#5. This falling second is
present in the contrasting idea (mm. 26–27) from E5 to D♯5, though adjusted intervalically to a minor second because of the underlying harmony. In this way, the looser construction of this Hybrid 3—when compared to the first (true) sentence of the first stanza—is more unified and tightly fashioned than it appears on the music’s surface, therefore emphasizing its connection to stanza 1 and the overall formal construction of the song. To be sure, this kind of disguised formal cohesion is not uncommon in Strauss’s songs; in fact, we have already examined such voice-leading features in previous examples.

A looser connection between these two sentences is in the piano accompaniment. The accompaniment to mm. 24–32 alludes to the steady eighth-note triplet arpeggios that appear in mm. 1–9. In the second stanza, these triplets are transformed from all eighth-note triplets to a combination of eighth-note triplets and sixteenth-note sextuplets, which derive from the eighth-note triplets. Furthermore, the arpeggios heard in the first stanza are in some cases filled in by step in the second stanza. Strauss’s use of arpeggiated and filled-in eighth-note triplets and sixteenth-note sextuplets contrasts the slower rhythmic values in both hands of the piano. For example, the half notes present in mm. 24–32 recall the bass whole notes in mm. 1–9, contributing to a few moments of apparent musical repose in the midst of a much more active accompaniment in the second stanza.

Like the first sentence of stanzas 1 and 2, the second sentence of these two stanzas (mm. 11–24 and 34–45, respectively) also share some similar voice-leading and accompaniment features. First, whereas the local melodic structural emphasis is on C♯5 in the first sentence of stanzas 1 and 2, there is a new focus on D5 in the second sentence of these stanzas, especially in stanza 1. Notice that the C♯5 harmonized by IV in m. 14 functions as a passing tone between B4 in m. 11 and D5 in m. 20 (refer especially to Figure 4.6). This C♯5 is prolonged for quite some time through mm. 14–19, held as a common tone in each of the underlying harmonies.
Figure 4.6. “Befreit,” Op. 39, No. 4; Voice-Leading Sketch.
In the second sentence of the second stanza, both C#5 and D5 are emphasized. Here, D is subordinate to C#, functioning as an incomplete neighbor tone (m. 42) to C#, which, itself, is also an incomplete neighbor tone to B (m. 36). Notice in Figure 4.6 the difference between the incomplete-neighbor and passing motions in the second sentence of stanzas 1 and 2. The second sentence of stanza 1 serves to connect melodically the Kopfton (5, B4) on either end—that is, the sentence begins (explicitly) and ends (implicitly) on 5. In this way, C#5 functions as a complete neighbor tone to B4. However, in the second sentence of stanza 2, the melodic span begins on the Kopfton but ends on 4 of the Urlinie (A4), initiating the descent of the fundamental line. Accordingly, C#5’s structural role is different in stanza 2. Rather than tracing a complete neighbor motion from B4 in m. 33 to the implied melodic B4 in m. 44, C#5 descends by third to A4 in m. 45, connecting with 4 of the fundamental line. In fact, this is the same voice leading that we saw earlier in this stanza, where the incomplete-neighbor tone C# connected with 4 of the Urlinie replica in mm. 29–30.

Compared with the first sentence of stanzas 1 and 2, the second sentence is much longer and elaborated in terms of the Classical model. Notice in stanza 1 that after a 4-bar presentation phrase (mm. 11–14), the continuation phrase spins out melodic-motivic fragments for another nine measures (mm. 15–23) before eliding with the beginning of stanza 2 (m. 24). Similarly, the continuation phrase of stanza 2’s second sentence fragments melodic-motivic material for eight measures before cadencing (mm. 37–45). Most notable, however, is the structure of the presentation phrase of this sentence in stanza 2 (mm. 34–36). This presentation phrase features only one complete statement of the basic idea (mm. 34–36); the repetition of the basic idea (m. 37) is compressed from a 2-bar unit to only a single bar. In total, the presentation phrase spans three measures (mm. 34–37; see the phrase counts for this passage in Figure 4.5) divided as 2 bars + 1 bar,
rather than a normative 4-bar span divided as 2 bars + 2 bars.\textsuperscript{13} The compression of the second statement of the basic idea contrasts the great expansion in the sentence’s continuation phrase, addressed below. In terms of the progression from clarity to obscurity through the song, this compressed presentation phrase greatly challenges and distorts the Classical-model sentence paradigm. In fact, this particular sentence is the formal unit heard just before the beginning of the third stanza, which is the most ambiguous of the three.

The similarity of accompaniment pattern in the second sentence of stanzas 1 and 2 is immediately apparent, even with a quick glance at the score. From the chorale-like block chords to the reintroduction of eighth-note triplets, these characteristics of the second sentences are present in each stanza. Furthermore, the continuation phrase of these sentences is saturated with dramatic suspension figures, which, in conjunction with Strauss’s text-setting, reveal something about the uncertainty conveyed in the poem. For example, each stanza of the poem ends with the exclamation: “o Glück!”/“O luck!”; however, Strauss chooses to set this exclamation by way of a suspension figure over a non-final harmony. In stanza 1, “o Glück” is set as a suspension over an applied diminished-seventh chord to the local V\textsubscript{7} (m. 19); in stanza 2, which highlights a greater sense of musical obscurity, the two words are set as a 4–3 suspension over a supertonic chord in the local key of A major (m. 41). The suspension and figures and the harmonies over which they occur represent the hesitation and uncertainty associated with trusting that one’s death will lead to a greater wellbeing when one’s earthly presence expires. In my analysis of stanza 3 below, we will see how Strauss no only sets “o Glück” consonantly at the end of the song, but he also repeats the

\textsuperscript{13} An alternative analysis of this passage might consider mm. 34–37 as a single, 3-bar unit rather than dividing the three bars in a 2 bar + 1 bar configuration. In this case one could speak of what Mark Richards refers to as the “monofold” presentation phrase, in which there is only a single statement of the basic idea. See Mark Richards, “Viennese Classicism and the Sentential Idea: Broadening the Sentence Paradigm,” Theory and Practice 36 (2011): 179–224. In terms of this reading corresponding with the overall progression from clarity to obscurity in “Befreit,” the “monofold” presentation places the status of the second sentence of stanza 2 as a derivative of the Classical-model sentence—which maintains a similarly non-normative status as the compressed presentation phrase. In all, either reading supports and parallels the ways in which the poem reflects a sentimental trajectory from clear to hazy.
exclamation twice (once over the dominant and once over the tonic) as if to assure us of the hope of
perfect immortality in the afterlife.

In the progression from musical clarity to obscurity—from adherence to a freedom from the
Classical-model sentence paradigm—stanza 3 of “Befreit” exhibits much compositional freedom in
terms of form, harmony, and voice leading. On its own, stanza 3 might seem exceptional—perhaps
even non-sentential—but in the context of stanzas 1 and 2, we can see that it is yet another variation
on the Classical-model sentence. Specifically, stanza 3 comprises both a Hybrid 3 and a sentence,
each with the characteristic accompanimental gestures discussed above; however, the span of each
theme-type is longer, the harmonic progressions in each sentence are more adventurous, and the
voice leading of each sentence is more intricate and obscure. Beginning with the form of the Hybrid
3 (mm. 46–56), this 11-bar unit comprises a 7-bar presentation phrase and a 4-bar continuation
phrase. As we have seen in previous examples, Strauss does not often expand the presentation
phrase of Hybrid 3s or sentences; rather, he usually reserves phrase expansion for continuation
phrases. Here, however, I am inclined to analyze two 2-bar ideas: the first is a basic idea in mm. 46–
47, and the second is a contrasting idea whose first half, for harmonic reasons, begins in m. 48 and
whose second half begins in m. 51. This means that the two halves of the contrasting idea are
separated by two measures of melodic-motivic material that seems related to the basic and
contrasting ideas but remains parenthetical to them (refer back to Figure 4.3). The harmonic reasons
for this analysis surround the progression in mm. 46–53. Specifically, I find that the German
augmented-sixth chord constructed on G♭ (mm. 49–50) interrupts the progression from the C4{3
chord (in mm. 47–48) to the first-inversion E-minor triad (mm. 51–52). This reading requires
hearing an enharmonic interpretation of the C dominant-seventh chord in mm. 47–48 as another
German augmented-sixth chord constructed on C, where C and B♭ (=A#) both resolve outward to B
(according to their tendencies), while E and G are maintained as common tones. In second
inversion (and understood enharmonically as a German augmented-sixth chord), the C\textsuperscript{4\textsubscript{i}} resolves perfectly correctly to the first-inversion E-minor triad. Hence, the phrase counts I have added to the compound basic idea reflect that the parenthetical measures function as “stand-ins” for a (4) that completes the melodic motion from m. 48 to 49, and a (3) that initiates melodic motion from m. 50 to 51. In all, this reading acknowledges the phrase expansion in the compound basic idea in terms of a 4-bar model, while also accounting for the underlying voice leading being supported by an obscure harmonic progression. Notice in my voice-leading sketch for this passage that the ultimate goal of the A2 in the bass is the neighbor tone G2, which corresponds with the bass support for the contrasting idea (refer back to Figure 4.4).

As the poem draws to a close in its final three lines, the music through which Strauss conveys the poem’s beloved’s liberation from the mortality of earthly life becomes nearly free of its ties to functional tonality. Whereas the form of these final measures (mm. 57–76) conform to a loosely knit, yet identifiable, sentence structure, the harmonic underpinnings challenge the cohesion of the formal unit. Most striking, if not problematic, is the abrupt foreground progression from an F-major triad to an E-minor triad in mm. 61–62. In the preceding two measures, E begins to be reintroduced at the foreground level after many harmonic turns and local modulations. The D\#2 at the end of m. 59 (and through the first half of m. 60) proposes the leading tone in E. This D\# resolves upward to E (m. 59); however, the harmonic progression is deceptive, achieving a C dominant-seventh chord in first inversion rather than an E-minor triad in root position. This C dominant-seventh chord progresses to an F-major triad, which functions as Ⅳ in E (mm. 60). The Ⅳ sounds as the presentation phrase concludes and the continuation phrase begins (mm. 60–61). If, phenomenologically, we experience the Ⅳ chord as an intermediate harmony, our listening experience—in terms of functional tonality—may very well direct our ears to anticipate a dominant chord following the Ⅳ chord in these measures; however, Ⅳ slides downward by a half step,
settling on an E-minor triad (m. 62). This interesting harmonic digression calls into question whether or not E had been reestablished at all on a local level and how the descent of the fundamental line can be accounted for. After the arrival on the E-minor triad, the music progresses from I to #VII through a passing #III# ¾ (mm. 62–66), just like the opening measures of the song. Furthermore, #3 of the Urlinie is introduced over #III# ¾ and oscillates between #3 and ½3 in mm. 67 and 68, respectively. The descent of the fundamental line completes as #3 falls to 2 in m. 69, and 2 to 1 in m. 70. With all of these details in place regarding this passage’s harmonic and structural/voice-leading profile, we can begin to make sense of how the song accomplishes both (functional) tonal and structural closure.

Let us return to the appearance of the #II chord in m. 60. I propose that this chord arises from a long-range 5–6 technique, beginning in m. 46 at the A-minor triad (which also marks the beginning of stanza 3). In my voice-leading sketch, I indicate the 5–6 motion with upward stems that connect to a beam above the bass staff. The voice leading over this span of measures prolongs the predominant region and supports 4 of the Urlinie. Other than the foreground parallel fifths generated by the motion from #II to I, I remark again that finding proper support for the fundamental line is crucial to the structural descent and closure of this piece.

As David Beach has noted, one possibility for supporting #3 of the Urlinie is by way of the cadential six-four.14 I suggest that this is the case in these final measures of “Befreit.” In an attempt to separate the functional strength of the prolonged predominant region, I observe the E-minor triad as a stand-in root-position variant for the onset of the cadential six-four—and therefore the

---

Note from my voice-leading sketch that I unfold the interval of a descending fourth from E3 (m. 62) to B2 (m. 68) as a composing-out of the cadential six-four, which, in m. 68 becomes—literally—the cadential six-four with 5 in the bass. Accordingly, scale degrees 3 and 4 can both be supported in this span of seven measures. Similarly, the motivic bassline and progression derived from the opening measures of the song can be illustrated in the bass. It is in this gesture that Strauss is able to achieve a number of musical necessities: he is able to (1) distinguish the predominant and dominant regions, (2) generate functionally tonal harmonic closure, and (3) fully support the descent of the fundamental line, all while recalling motivic material previously stated in the piece and highlighting the uncertainty of life versus death through the oscillation between 3 and 4.

This unusual final stanza completes the musical journey from clarity to obscurity that conveys the poem’s depiction of the freedom from pain, suffering, and death in the mortal world. Strauss’s liberation from the confines of strict Classical-model sentences becomes increasingly apparent over the course of this song. The manifestations of this freedom are found in form, harmony, and voice leading, which interact with one another in very different ways than they did in many of the other songs discussed in this and previous chapters. What remains, however, is Strauss’s apparent commitment to the evocation of poetic meaning through text-setting, form, harmony, and voice leading, as they relate to Classical-model paradigms and the elaborations thereof.

CHAPTER 5
CONCLUSION AND POSSIBILITIES FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

1. Conclusion

In this dissertation, I address several ways in which Richard Strauss elaborates the Classical-model sentence and period paradigms. In some cases, Strauss adopts Classical-model sentence and period structures, elaborating them only by way of an underlying chromatic, Romantic-style harmonic palette. In other cases, Strauss elaborates these theme-types by way of phrase expansion, generally found in the continuation phrase of a sentence or in the consequent phrase of period. In still other cases, Strauss elaborates sentences and periods by creating hybrid variants. I offer labels for these hybrid variants based on their melodic-motivic, harmonic, and phrase-length profile: the Straussian Hybrid Sentence, the Straussian Hybrid Period, and the Lone Antecedent Phrase. In fashioning these labels, I aim to encapsulate a certain sense of their musical shape, suggesting especially that these formal structures derive from familiar Classical models, but in some Strauss-specific ways. As such, this dissertation offers insight into how Strauss extended Classical formal patterns in his Romantic and late-Romantic style.

The methodology I use in this dissertation takes on its own kind of hybrid approach, which responds to Janet Schmalfeldt’s 1991 article on reconciling form-function theory with Schenkerian theory and analysis. I assume this hybrid attitude toward form and voice-leading analysis in an attempt to comprehensively analyze the songs I have chosen to study. It is often the case that where Strauss obfuscates normative Classical theme-types, he embeds the inherent unification of their formal structure in other ways, namely through voice leading and the melodic-motivic interplay between voice and piano. Accordingly, in Chapters 2–4 I present form overlays and voice-leading sketches for each of the excerpts or full songs I present. By so doing, I highlight how one type
analysis informs the other, especially when one or the other kind does not seem to fully account for a particular passage of music.

In my discussion of the songs included in this dissertation, I also consider how the structure, meaning, and Strauss's text-setting of the poetry relate to my reading of form and voice leading. In nearly all cases, Strauss attends carefully to the structure of the poetry, emphasizing its rhyme scheme and internal division points (by way of punctuation) in his musical setting. Specifically, I show how Strauss navigates sentential settings of four-line stanzas with rhyming pairs on lines 1 & 3 and 2 & 4, some of which present commas at the end of each line. Inherently, this kind of poetic organization compromises the continuity present in the sentence paradigm—that is, the continuation phrase, which likely comprises lines 3 and 4, is marked not only by a divisional internal rhyme (line 3 rhymes with line 1) but also by a pause in the poetic fluidity. The most ideal poetic structures for sentential settings are those where there is an enjambment that fuses lines 3 and 4, even if the end of line 3 presents the rhyming partner to line 1. As for periodic structures, the ideal poetic structure features enjambments that fuse lines 1 & 2 and 3 & 4, with rhyming pairs and some indication of a poetic pause at the end of lines 2 and 4. Most of my analyses use the poetry to help clarify form and voice leading; however, some examples do the opposite.

limited point of his career; rather, Strauss fashioned sentences and hybrid sentences across many pieces from various sets, sometimes highlighting various types of elaborations within a single Opus or even a single song (such is the case with “Leises Lied” and “Befreit,” Op. 39, Nos. 1 and 4).

Instances of Classical-model sentences and sixteen-measure sentences in Strauss’s songs adhere strictly to the melodic-motivic, harmonic, and phrase-length features described by William Caplin, as heard in “Befreit” and “Ich trage meine Minne.” In some cases, Strauss expands Classical-model sentences by various phrase-expansion techniques, as heard in “Mohnblumen” and “Leises Lied.” As noted above, there is an overall trend in Strauss’s songs toward the expansion of a normative 8- or 16-bar sentence in its continuation phrase. This effusiveness often relates to the poetry in some way: generally speaking, the phrase expansion either corresponds with “extra” lines or words in a poem’s structure, or with the expansion expresses a rhetorical aspect of the poem through formal means. Yet, in other songs, Strauss expresses elaborations of sentences whose melodic-motivic organization is noticeably different from a Classical-model sentence; specifically, these structures—which I label as Straussian Hybrid Sentences—exhibit a “presentation” phrase comprising a compound basic idea rather than a basic idea and its repetition. In the simplest terms, the structure compound basic idea + continuation engages Caplin’s Hybrid 3 model; however, rather than adopting this term altogether, I retain the term “hybrid,” but add “Straussian” before it and “sentence” after it. By so doing, I acknowledge the hybrid nature of this structure and its closeness to Classical model-sentence structure. I also propose through this label that Strauss’s chromatic, Romantic harmonic palette often necessitates the re-working of terminology that describes the parameters of Classical music not inherent in Romantic music. Instead, Strauss—through his Romantic style—comes quite close to composing formal structures that resemble a Classical paradigm; however, the Romantic elements of these forms are enough to distance them from labels
devoted solely to Classical music, but not enough to be completely divorced from them. I identify Straussian Hybrid Sentences in “Winternacht,” “Wiegenliedchen,” and “Allerseelen.”

In Chapter 3, I analyze examples of Classical-model periods in addition to two related categories: the Straussian Hybrid Period and the Lone Antecedent Phrase. I define the Straussian Hybrid Period as comprising a normative antecedent phrase (2-bar basic idea + 2-bar contrasting idea, ending with a weak cadence) followed by a hybrid consequent phrase that dissolves and is guised as one of several possible formal outcomes, such as a sentence, a continuation phrase, or a cadential unit. In the case of any of these three hybrid consequent options, the phrase ends with a cadence stronger than the one that ended the antecedent phrase. As I discuss in Chapter 1, a Straussian Hybrid Period may take on the appearance of Caplin’s Hybrid 1 (antecedent + continuation) or Hybrid 2 (antecedent + cadential) models; however, for similar reasons as to why I distinguish a Straussian Hybrid Sentence from Caplin’s Hybrid 3, I account for the Straussian Hybrid Period’s divergence from the Classical-model period. Notice that Straussian Hybrid Periods have the potential to greatly distort the symmetry of a model period—that is, the antecedent phrase (four measures total) is often much shorter than the second half of the structure. To be sure, and in accordance with his style, Strauss’s harmonic language and general formal effusiveness is best accounted for by labels different from those offered by Caplin for the analysis of Classical instrumental music.

The second formal structure I address in Chapter 3 is the Lone Antecedent Phrase, which—as per its name—describes an antecedent phrase that is not followed by a consequent phrase, whether normative or hybrid. In these cases, it is difficult to speak of a “true” periodic design; rather, the first half of a perceived period is present (basic idea + contrasting idea, ending with a weak cadence), but there is no musical (or even rhetorical) completion of this musical unit. As I note earlier in this dissertation, these structures in particular call into question whether an antecedent
phrase must or should be followed by a consequent phrase, especially in Romantic music. My answer to this question—like Caplin’s—is no; rather, the initiation of a particular formal unit may be denied and left open-ended for poetic and/or rhetorical reasons, which is often the specific case in Strauß’s songs. In all, the progression of songs in Chapter 3 follow a similar organization as those in Chapter 2—that is, I present examples that progress from most- to least-normative. In all, I survey six excerpts: “Für fünfzehn Pfennige,” Op. 36, No. 2, and “Ach weh unglückhaften Mann,” Op. 21, No. 4 (Classical-Model Periods); “Mit deinen blauen Augen,” Op. 56, No. 4, “Die Zeitlose,” Op. 10, No. 7, and “Schön sind, doch kalt die Himmelssterne,” Op. 19, No. 3 (Straussian Hybrid Periods); and “Das Bächlein,” Op. 88, No. 1 (Lone Antecedent Phrase).

In Chapter 4, I provide full-song analyses of three songs: “Zueignung,” Op. 10, No. 1, “Allerseelen,” Op. 10, No. 8, and “Befreit,” Op. 39, No. 4. Through the analysis of each of these songs at multiple levels of formal and voice-leading structure, I highlight the inherent interaction between aspects of musical construction and how those aspects relate and respond to the poetry that Strauß sets. In the case of “Zueignung” and “Allerseelen,” there is a progression from obscurity to clarity that spans the duration of the song. What Strauß poses as formal or harmonic “problems” at the beginning of the song are either solved, or at least clarified, by the end of the song. Furthermore, the poems from which these two songs are derived also play an important role in emphasizing the general musical clarification present in each. Conversely, the poem from which “Befreit” is derived poses the opposite rhetorical effect—that is, “Befreit” traces a progression from clarity to obscurity, rather than the opposite effect found in “Zueignung” and “Allerseelen.” Just as the poem speaks of one’s freedom from the troubles of life in their death, Strauß represents this freedom by way of progressively abandoning strict ties to Classical-model sentence structure. Certainly the benefit of examining excerpts of songs in Chapters 2 and 3 allows me to showcase the references to Classical formal paradigms in Strauß’s music; however, the full-song analyses presented in Chapter 4 depict
how Strauss’s elaborations of Classical theme-types are done so in the service of conveying poetic meaning.

2. Possibilities for Further Research

I have provided a selection of songs that represent various “styles” exhibited by Strauss throughout his compositional career. In order to accomplish this goal, I have surveyed songs from various published collections, in addition to showing how Strauss conveys numerous styles and sounds even among songs in a single Opus. No matter how comprehensively representative one strives to be in a single document, there is always room for further research. Furthermore, there are always extensions of any particular research project. In terms of this project, I can envision a number of related topics that are worth investigating, such as: (1) whether Strauss sets poems by particular poets as particular theme-types, (2) whether other Classical theme-types exist in Strauss’s songs, (3) whether one can derive and define other Strauss-specific forms (at either the phrase or full-song level), (4) whether there is a general set of voice-leading principles at the fore- and middleground levels that govern Strauss’s music, (5) whether the frequency at which Classical-model sentences and periods are present in Strauss’s operas and instrumental music, or even (6) whether what I call Strauss-specific forms (like the Straussian Hybrid Sentence and Period) are present in the music of his contemporaries.

In my preliminary research for this topic, I examined all of Strauss’s songs for voice and piano and noted the staggering prevalence of sentential and periodic structures. Unfortunately, it is impossible to include every example in a single document such as this; however, I provide below a number of songs that I believe would benefit from a closer look and further analysis (Table 5.1). Just as I have shown in Chapters 2–4 of this dissertation, Strauss’s realization of sentences, periods, and their elaborations range from straightforward to quite vague. Similarly, most of the songs listed
below fit somewhere on that spectrum, with a few exhibiting ambiguous form that falls somewhere between a sentence and period.

Table 5.1. Strauss Songs for Further Research on Sentences, Periods, and their Elaborations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sentences (or elaborations thereof)</th>
<th>Periods (or elaborations thereof, including Lone Antecedent Phrases)</th>
<th>Ambiguous Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Op. 27, No. 3</td>
<td>Op. 22, No. 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Op. 29, No. 1</td>
<td>Op. 27, No. 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Op. 32, No. 2</td>
<td>Op. 29, No. 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Op. 36, No. 4</td>
<td>Op. 31, No. 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Op. 37, No. 2</td>
<td>Op. 32, Nos. 4 &amp; 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Op. 39, No. 2</td>
<td>Op. 43, No. 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Op. 41, No. 2</td>
<td>Op. 46, No. 3 &amp; 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Op. 43, No. 2</td>
<td>Op. 47, No. 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Op. 46, Nos. 1, 2, 3, &amp; 4</td>
<td>Op. 49, Nos. 5 &amp; 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Op. 47, Nos. 3 &amp; 4</td>
<td>Op. 56, No. 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Op. 48, Nos. 2, 4, &amp; 5</td>
<td>Op. 66, Nos. 6 &amp; 12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Op. 49, Nos. 2, 4, &amp; 7</td>
<td>Op. 69, Nos. 3 &amp; 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Op. 56, Nos. 2, 3, &amp; 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Op. 66, Nos. 1, 2, 5, 7, &amp; 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Op. 68, No. 1, 2, &amp; 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Op. 69, Nos. 1, 2, &amp; 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Op. 77, No. 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Op. 88, No. 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As Table 5.1 makes clear, there are plenty of other sentential and periodic structures that can be investigated in Strauss’s songs. The table also helps to reiterate the notion that Strauss did not limit himself to integrating Classical-model theme-types in his songs for formal organization. Furthermore, this corresponds with the fact that Strauss’s compositional “periods”—early, middle, and late—were not exclusively dedicated to one particular style. Rather, Strauss’s sound was timeless in many ways, save for the few experimental works in his middle period. Many of his late songs are
as early-Romantic in style as the early songs. As such, an investigation of traditional forms in his songs seems to be the “right fit” for those interested in exploring them.
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