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Abstract

After Beethoven’s compositional achievements, particularly those of his late period, nineteenth-century composers drew on his ideas in many different ways. The harmonic language of music darkened considerably in the nineteenth century, with strong chromaticism becoming prevalent and Wagner’s influence being felt throughout the Western Musical World. One way many nineteenth-century compositions were harmonically organised was with axial tonality, a system which privileges major-third relationships due to their functional equivalence. Composers from Beethoven onward were familiar with such organisational principles, and the instrumental works of César Franck make an illuminating case study in how axial tonality operates in a deeply chromatic context. This thesis examines how chromatic harmony might operate within the functional principles of tonality despite an enriched harmonic language, and what changes were necessary to formal models as a result. Seminal late-Beethovenian works are examined and their internal procedures deduced: this is discussed in relation to immanent and transcendent dominants which operate differently in each formal prototype. Works of César Franck are then examined, to deduce their harmonic language and formal procedures. Though some of Franck’s works display allegiance to Beethoven’s formal models, others have their own peculiar inner workings. These findings are discussed in relation to axial tonality, the importance of rhythm, and cyclic form, a technique closely associated with Franck.
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Chapter One

César Franck

While César Franck’s music is the primary focus of this study, his background is also important. By surveying his upbringing, significant compositions, musical influences and personality, subtle threads emerge; our perception of Franck, composer and artist, becomes clearer. This chapter is built around a chronology of Franck’s life and work before an analysis of his persona. It draws from the important twentieth-century biographers and includes a brief survey of Franck’s significant works, justifying which of these I have selected for closer analysis. The review concludes by identifying issues of Franck reception – including historical conditions around 1870 – and discussing the issue of musical influences.

Franck Biography

César Auguste Jean Guillaume Hubert Franck – a “misfortunate” name as Liszt described it¹ – was born on December 10th 1822 in Liège, Belgium. He had one younger brother, Joseph, a violinist. As Franck showed propensity for music from an early age, his father, Nicolas Joseph, decided that César would have a career as a virtuoso pianist. After study and prizes from the Liège Conservatoire, his father organised a Parisian concert debut in 1835. The concert was not a success, but the family had by then moved to Paris, where his father persevered with the virtuoso dream. Though César was at first refused entry to the Paris Conservatoire because of his Belgian nationality (Liszt had also been refused on the basis of his Hungarian nationality a decade earlier), ² Franck studied harmony and

counterpoint privately with Reicha, who had studied with Beethoven and taught Liszt and Berlioz, and is a possible catalyst of transmission between these composers.³ At the age of 14, in April 1837, Franck met Liszt for the first time; the occasion was a concert where César played a Fantasy by Hummel.⁴ This relationship would prove influential for the young Franck, who – as discussed below – received feedback on his early compositions from Liszt. After entering the Paris Conservatoire in October of that year after his father secured naturalisation papers, Franck won prizes in piano, organ and counterpoint; yet in 1842 his father withdrew him before he could contest the coveted Prix de Rome, organising a Belgian concert tour so that Franck could concentrate on his virtuoso career instead.⁵

When not on tour during the next few years Franck stayed with his family in Liége.⁶ He began composing and in 1843 his first compositions, Trios concertants Op. 1 for Piano, Violin and Cello, were published. Liszt, Meyerbeer, Halévy and Chopin purchased copies, among others. Franck and Liszt had met a second time – probably in Brussels, in 1842 – and it was on Liszt’s advice that Franck exchanged the finales of his Trio Op.1 No.3 and his Trio Op.2 No.4.⁷

Sadly enough for his father, Franck’s virtuoso career never eventuated: his final Parisian concert tour in 1844 suffered from a poor critical reception. One critic

³ Davies points out that Franck was only 13 and 14 when he studied with Reicha, and warns us about placing a disproportionate amount of weight on the relationship. Laurence Davies, César Franck and His Circle (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1970), 48. However, we know that composers can be influenced substantially by their early teachers, and J.C. Bach’s influence on Mozart is surely perceptible. Cliff Eisen et al., “Mozart,” in Grove Music Online. Oxford Music Online. (2010). Though it is difficult to establish either way, Reicha certainly remains a possible connection between Beethoven and Franck.
⁴ Williams, ed. Franz Liszt: Selected Letters, 966.
⁵ Trevitt and Fauquet, "César Franck," 178.
⁶ Léon Vallas, César Franck (George G. Harrap & Co. Ltd., 1951), 47.
⁷ Ibid.
⁸ Trevitt and Fauquet, "César Franck."
compared Franck to Vaucanson’s mechanical puppet, one of the city’s attractions; others complained about the “standard of César’s execution.” Nevertheless, Franck returned to Paris later that year and by 1846 was making a living through teaching privately. He continued to compose, and after the Trios came Franck’s first large-scale work, the biblical oratorio *Ruth*, which premièred in 1846. The oratorio brings about further evidence of an association with Liszt, in the form of a letter from Liszt to Ary Scheffer supporting *Ruth*. “You have had confirmation . . . of the opinion I gave you of [Franck’s] oratorio *Ruth*”, writes Liszt, “and the great master [Meyerbeer’s] sincere approbation seems to me to make the matter conclusive. . . among the young people who sweat blood and water to set down some ideas on cheap music paper, I know not three who are his equal.” Yet despite Liszt’s support and the recent success of Félicien David’s *Le désert* – an oratorio with similar subject material – Franck’s *Ruth* received a poor reception until its revision many years later. This put further stress on Franck’s relationship with his father, and Franck formally left his parents’ home in the summer of 1846. In 1847 he obtained an organist’s post at Notre Dame de Lorette: the menial role of organiste accompagnateur or choir accompanist.

In 1848 Franck married one of his pupils, and in 1851 he became organist at St Jean-St François, which possessed an organ built by Cavaillé-Coll. In 1858 he bettered this by his appointment to Ste Clotilde, which possessed a fine new organ, again from the Cavaillé-Coll company. It was on this organ that Liszt heard Franck play in 1866. On this occasion Franck played from his *Six Pièces* for organ, a set that represents one of the most significant contributions to the French organ repertory in over a century. “How could I ever forget the composer of those Trios?” Liszt reputedly asked, to which Franck replied: “I fancy I have done better things

---

9 Davies, *César Franck and His Circle*, 52.
11 Trevitt and Fauquet, “César Franck.”
since”.\textsuperscript{12} From these anecdotes it seems that Franck was merely one of many nineteenth-century musicians whom Liszt helped.\textsuperscript{13} Yet this conclusion would not necessarily negate the formal similarities in the works of these two men, which I will discuss below.

All of Franck’s organ works, including the \textit{Six Pièces} of this period, are influenced by the capabilities of Cavaillé-Coll’s instruments. Franck worked stoically at Ste Clotilde for the next decade, continuing to teach and play the organ, with little time for composition. Trevitt writes: “It was during this creatively fallow period that he was unwittingly laying the foundations of a remarkable phenomenon of 19th-century [sic] French culture: the cluster of pupil-disciples”\textsuperscript{14}, though it should be noted that Liszt and Wagner attracted similar “clusters”. Franck’s pupils included Duparc and Coquard, to whom he taught piano at the Jesuit College in the rue Vaurigard. In 1870, however, the Franco-Prussian war disrupted life; during the war and the ensuing Commune, the Conservatoire closed and advanced music education in Paris ground to a halt. The psychological effects of the Franco-Prussian war and the Commune had a profound effect on French musical life in the coming decades. When the Conservatoire reopened in 1872 François Benoist retired from his post of organ professor. Franck was appointed to succeed him, and this necessitated applying for French citizenship.\textsuperscript{15} The \textit{Société Nationale de Musique} formed after the war, with Franck becoming President in 1880.\textsuperscript{16} Aside from this, Franck’s organ class throughout the 1870s and 1880s gained the reputation of being composition-focused. His pupils were unusually devoted, forming the “band à Franck.” Vincent d’Indy, who joined the organ class

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{12} Davies, \textit{César Franck and His Circle}, 109.
\item \textsuperscript{13} Williams, ed. \textit{Franz Liszt: Selected Letters}, 966.
\item \textsuperscript{14} Trevitt and Fauquet, "César Franck."
\item \textsuperscript{15} Rollin Smith, \textit{Playing the Organ Works of César Franck} (New York: Pendragon Press, 1997), 29.
\item \textsuperscript{16} Trevitt and Fauquet, "César Franck."
\end{itemize}
in 1872 and became Franck’s most devoted disciple, led this group. It was only in the 1870’s that Franck began to hit his compositional stride; the best loved and well known Franck compositions are those that date between 1875 and 1890. Compared to the output from his earlier years the list is surprisingly long:

*Rédemption* (oratorio – revised – symphonic poem, several versions) 1874;
*Les bénédiction* (oratorio) 1869 – 1879;
*Les Eolides* (symphonic poem) 1875-6;
*Trois Pièces* (organ) 1878;
*Quintette* (piano quintet) 1879;
*Rebecca* (oratorio) 1880-1;
*Le chasseur maudit* (symphonic poem) 1882;
*Les Djinns* (symphonic poem) 1884;
*Prélude, choral et fugue* (piano) 1884;
*Hulda* (opera) 1879-85;
*Variations symphoniques* (piano/orchestra) 1885;
*Sonate* (violin and piano) 1886;
*Prélude, aria et final* (piano) 1887;
*Psyché* (symphonic poem with chorus) 1887-8;
*Symphonie*, 1886-8;
*Quatuor* (string quartet), 1889;
*Trois chorals* (organ), 1890; and
*Ghiselle* (opera) 1888-90.

Franck died in November 1890 from complications resulting from pleurisy.

The following larger segments of this chapter present the challenges of researching César Franck. These include: Franck’s personality and the biased nature of his first

---

17 Ibid. Accessed 23.7.09
18 Vallas, *César Franck*, 234.
biographers; issues of Franck’s nationality and what implications these may have, including the effect of the Franco-Prussian war on the French musical psyche; and an overview and hypotheses of Franck’s most important musical influences.

**Franck’s Biographers**

This section examines two important themes in Franck biography: his personality, and the changing reception of his compositions.

*Franck’s personality: an “aura of sanctity?”*

Vincent d’Indy, a pupil from Franck’s organ class at the Conservatoire, wrote the first account of Franck’s life and work in his 1906 biography *César Franck*. D’Indy provides background to Franck’s childhood and upbringing, and includes brief analyses of his important works. However, the biography also contains a number of inaccuracies, one of the most significant being d’Indy’s claim that Franck began composing his Symphony before he heard Saint-Saëns’ Symphony in C minor. By claiming this, d’Indy was in a strong position to argue Franck’s originality in the symphonic genre and ensure Franck’s Symphony compared favourably with Saint-Saëns’. Recent research suggests, however, that Franck had not even begun his own Symphony before hearing Saint-Saëns’. However, d’Indy is certainly not alone in his adoration of Franck; indeed, this is a theme that runs through the writings of all Franck’s pupils.

Franck’s other pupils discussed their teacher’s life and work in articles and correspondence. An excerpt translated from Guy Ropartz’s book “A propos de

---

20 Ibid., 173.
21 A. Peter Brown and Brian Hart, *The Symphonic Repertoire Volume III Part B: The European Symphony from ca. 1800 to ca. 1930: Great Britain, Russia, and France* (Bloomington and Indianapolis Indiana University Press, 2008), 593.
22 Ibid., 590.
quelques symphonies modernes” indicates how devoted Franck’s pupils were to their Master:

Among the multitude of contemporary composers, M. César Franck appears to be a man from another time. They are skeptics, he is a believer; they are occupied with themselves, he works in silence; they seek glory, he awaits it; others make concessions and compromises – the basest even, the shameful steps towards easy fame – while he works quietly and firmly at what he has to do, without hesitation, without weakness, without calculation; he has given us the most beautiful example of artistic probity one could encounter.\footnote{Guy Ropartz, “A propos de quelques symphonies modernes,” \textit{Notations artistiques}, Paris: Lemerre, 1891, 181, quoted in \textit{ibid.}, 592.}

If we hold this description to be (in the least partially) accurate, it suggests that Franck considered himself a serious composer of serious music. This may seem unimportant, but when contemplating Franck’s influences it may be timely to consider that Franck may have wished to contribute to or emulate works within the “canon”. Discussing Franck’s Symphony, Ropartz considers that it contains “true philosophical thoughts.”\footnote{Ibid., 610.} Louis Vierne, a blind pupil, wrote about Franck with great warmth in his \textit{Mes Souvenirs}:\footnote{Louis Vierne, \textit{Mes Souvenirs}, (Paris: Les Amis de l’Orgue, 1970), Translated by Esther E. Jones as “Memoirs of Louis Vierne: His Life and Contacts with Famous Men,” \textit{The Diapason}, (Sept. 1938 – Sept. 1939), quoted in Rollin Smith, \textit{Toward an Authentic Interpretation of the Organ Works of César Franck} (New York: Pendragon Press, 1983), 42.}

Of Franck I had made almost a religion, combining passionate admiration, filial affection and profound respect. I experienced with intense joy, with which, however, there was also mingled a certain mysterious awe, the almost magnetic fascination which emanated from that man at the same time, so simple, so natural, so truly good.

In 1905 Albert Mahaut, another of Franck’s blind pupils, published a pamphlet: \textit{César Franck, Professeur d’Orgue}.\footnote{Translated and reprinted in \textit{ibid.}, 154.} He writes about how he came to be in Franck’s organ class, the wonderful warm resonance of Franck’s voice, and confirms much of what other pupils say of Franck’s personality: “The Maître was remarkably kind
toward all of his students” and, later, “His combined ardor and serenity overcame us and left an indelible imprint upon us.”27 Another pupil, Gabriel Pierné, in an interview with Pierre de Lapommeraye, describes Franck as being “very serious – he didn’t have a sense of humour.”28 Yet Pierné also describes Franck as “truly a beautiful soul, with an inexhaustible goodness, and a bit of naïveté.”29

Charles Tournimere was 19 years old when he studied with Franck in 1889. He subsequently published a biography of his teacher in 1930. Tournimere was an organist, and consequently focuses on analysing sections on Franck’s organ works. Tournimere uses over-ardent language, as does d’Indy in his biography; the exposition of Franck’s Fantasie Op. 16 is “white as snow” and Franck becomes the “Fra Angelico of Sound.”30 Tournimere’s volume is useful for organists as it contains performance instructions, but like other pupils his concern to depict Franck as a saintly figure betrays the lack of objectivity in his writing.

So why were Franck’s pupils so devoted? John Trevitt suggests it was because of Franck’s seriousness, suggesting this quality “stood in marked contrast to the superficiality of the Opéra-dominated establishment [the Conservatoire.]” 31 Perhaps it was this atmosphere that motivated Duparc when he wrote about Franck’s Symphony: “I would even say that a success at the Conservatoire would have disturbed me a bit – I will always refuse to admit that those people have the right to understand the things we love at first hearing.”32

27 Ibid., 155.
28 Ibid., 159.
29 Ibid., 161.
30 Ibid., 78 – 79.
31 Trevitt and Fauquet, “César Franck.”
Franck comes across as serious indeed when compared to contemporary organists. Fenner Douglass considers Franck’s disposition to be “diametrically opposed” to that of famed Parisian organist Lefébure-Wély, and sees this reflected in the styles of music in which each organist preferred to improvise and compose. Lefébure-Wély became famous for his “thunderstorm” improvisations and “showpieces” that proved popular with the public; Franck’s improvisations and compositions reflected a more serious, measured style, and in many reviews of his concerts he is described as “severe”, as well as being reprimanded for playing too long. Anecdotally at least, the musical styles seem to mirror each organist’s personality. This seems to have contributed to the reason that Franck was not awarded several prestigious organist posts in the 1850s and 60s, the most significant of these being the position at St-Sulpice left vacant by Lefébure-Wély’s death in 1869. With Franck and Widor being the two standout candidates, the middle-aged Franck was overlooked in favor of the young virtuoso Widor. Douglass describes this as “the most important organ position in France”, and although Franck succeeded Benoist at the Conservatoire a few years later, he was bitterly disappointed at missing out on the St-Sulpice post.

Norman Demuth provides short analyses of all of Franck’s main works, as well as biography and reception details, in his 1949 book César Franck. He devotes a chapter to examining the “aura of sanctity” surrounding Franck’s contemporary perception, declaring that “it [was] d’Indy, whose book so far has been the only one accessible in English, who has given us this [aura of sanctity] view and, knowing no better, we have taken what he said as gospel.” But Demuth also explores why Franck’s circle promulgated such ideas, suggesting it was due to

---

35 Norman Demuth, César Franck (London: Dennis Dobson Ltd., 1949), 205 – 08.
Franck’s personality. From the accounts of his pupils detailed above, we know Franck was a friendly, happy, gentle man; deeply religious and devoted to his pupils.\textsuperscript{36} Further anecdotes are easy to find: Ropartz stated “I never heard him say anything unkind about anyone”, whilst Debussy referred to him as “this intensely good man”.\textsuperscript{37} Demuth agrees with Trevitt, arguing that such accounts became legendary because such personality traits contrasted strongly with conventions at that time, as “Franck was surrounded with flippancies and artificiality [at the Conservatoire].” However, Demuth’s assessment is not difficult to agree with. Given what we know of the atmosphere cultivated by the Paris Conservatoire, Franck must have seemed saintly in comparison;\textsuperscript{38} Trevitt notes that it was an: “Opéra-dominated establishment” which contrasted strikingly with Franck’s serious personality.

Other writers also discuss Franck’s nature and references to him as a “Pater Seraphicus.” In the small 1932 volume \textit{French Piano Music} by Alfred Cortot, the author addresses both the “Franck Myth” and the subject of mysticism:

\begin{quote}
Not that I subscribe for my part to the favourite legend of a mystic César Franck, a sort of Pater Seraphicus lost in dreams of heaven, illumined with the ecstatic contemplative fervour which removed him from the pricks and realities of life. The nobility of Franck’s life, reflected perfectly in the beauty of his work, was precisely that he neither shook off reality nor despised the affairs of humanity, but rose above them.\textsuperscript{39}
\end{quote}

Writing later in the century, Lawrence Davies refutes it further:

\begin{quote}
The obstacles which stand in the way of portraying César Franck the man are already somewhat notorious. They refer not only to his retiring disposition, but to the unduly apologetic dispositions of his admirers. It is a fact that those who have
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{36} Ibid., 205.
\textsuperscript{37} Quoted in ibid.
\textsuperscript{38} Ibid., 209.
written about him most vividly also happen to be those least likely to have resorted to impartiality.\(^{40}\)

Davies is also pragmatic about other issues entangled with Franck biography, as “in being obliged to rebut the slanders of the composer’s enemies, [biographers] also have to be on their guard against over-dramatising a man who in essence was a singularly un-dramatic figure.”\(^{41}\) Perhaps symptomatic of this, Harvey Grace has observed that Franck’s reputation suffered – in England at least – because there was a “reaction against the uncritical adulation of his devotees in France.”\(^{42}\) It seems this reaction has taken much of the century to dissipate – though whether it has completely is up for contention.

Many of Franck’s early biographers are problematic as (secondary) sources as their emotionalised language indeed marks them as less than objective. Yet, as Davies mentions, they are the people who have written about him most vividly, and for many biographical aspects they are our best sources. Perhaps in the epoch his pupils needed a heroic figure, and Franck’s supportive nature lent him to this role. We know from contemporary accounts that although Franck was usually an understated man, he showed great enthusiasm when discussing music.\(^{43}\) Though it may appear that Franck has been “beatified” by his pupils, the writers of his history, he must have been a special man to invoke such a following. (Though he possessed a very different personality to Franck, Liszt also attracted a large cluster of pupil-disciples.\(^{44}\)) We can realise, from these accounts, that Franck was a warm, gentle and devoted person, and, with this measured analysis, consider what effect this may have had on his musical style and reception.

\(^{40}\) Davies, César Franck and His Circle, 4.
\(^{41}\) Ibid., 5.
\(^{43}\) Smith, Toward an Authentic Interpretation of the Organ Works of César Franck, 154.
Style and reception

With a few exceptions, Franck’s works received a poor reception during his lifetime, although for differing reasons. Ruth, Franck’s first oratorio and large-scale work, was compared unfavourably (and unfairly) to Rossini’s operas; Liszt stated that the Prélude, Choral et Fugue was “uncouth and tiresome to play”; and similarly, Prélude Aria et Final was described by one reviewer as “long and tedious.” Many of Franck’s works suffered from disastrous premières, including that of the Variations Symphoniques, where the piano and orchestra were completely out of sync for the entire finale, but perhaps worse was the premiere of Franck’s Piano Quintet, in which the pianist Saint-Saëns sight-read the work then stormed offstage when Franck attempted to dedicate the score to him. In some of these instances it is fair to say Franck was unlucky; in others, the reviews reflect attributes we recognise in Franck’s music today.

The String Quartet, however, was one of the few of Franck’s works that had a successful premiere, greeted as it was with “unmixed applause.” The Violin Sonata gradually grew in popularity, promoted by its dedicatee Eugene Ysaÿe, and continues to be one of Franck’s most popular works today. Furthermore, Franck’s organ works were largely well received in his lifetime, though their audience may have differed slightly from that for Franck’s later chamber works and orchestral pieces. Brian Hart describes Franck’s Symphony as “unquestionably the most controversial French symphony composed after Berlioz’s time.” His view is that some of this controversy was due to Franck’s heritage, which I discuss more fully below.
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Hart discusses the Symphony’s reception, with numerous references to contemporary reviews, and illustrates the marked differences in opinion between Franck’s sympathisers and critics. Though he concedes that Franck’s Symphony is not faultless, he surmises that some of the complaints about the Symphony arise from the way it is performed: “elements that appear in isolation as structural or stylistic flaws cohere to powerful effect . . . Franck is often blamed for the sins of the conductor.” On the whole, however, Franck received little public acclaim for the majority of his works. Whilst some works grew in acclaim after Franck’s death, others have almost fallen out of the repertoire entirely. Why this has happened is one question this thesis hopes to answer, but we must first survey Franck’s twentieth century reception.

In 1923 Harvey Grace published several articles in the journal *Musical Times* focusing on Franck’s organ works. In the eloquent narrative style of the day, Grace analyses all of Franck’s organ output, and is critical about Franck’s rich chromaticism and “mere meandering”, particularly in Franck’s *Trois Chorals*. Conversely, he considers the *Six Pièces* to be “direct and diatonic” – “better” is inferred – which is not the general consensus nowadays. Grace credits Wagner with influencing Franck’s chromatic idiom, and Beethoven is also considered an influence in matters of form: “The Chorals are merely fine examples of the large variation form of Beethoven’s last period . . . in regard to form and methods of development [Franck] looked rather to Bonn than to Leipzig” (a reference to
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Though limited to the organ works, Grace’s views give us some idea of the reception of Franck’s organ works in early twentieth-century England.

However an entry in Grove’s Dictionary – 3rd Edition (1927) demonstrates how Franck’s reception has changed over the years. Harvey Grace is the third edition author, and writes that in the piano works “we are . . . frequently reminded of Beethoven, Wagner [and] Liszt” (curious, as Grace had not earlier considered Liszt an important influence on Franck’s Organ works). The form of Franck’s Symphony is described as a “monologue rather than the sonata” (which is considered to the Symphony’s detriment). Grace’s summation of Franck as a man of contradictions is one of the best in the literature:

. . . a Belgian who founded a French school, yet whose own music is Belgian and German rather than French; who was a classicist in form and an impressionist in harmony; and whose whole career was a curious blend of drudgery and idealism, hack-work and inspiration.

In his 1951 book French Music, Martin Cooper is critical of much of Franck’s output. Cooper describes Franck’s main weakness as “his failure to subject his works to a sufficiently high critical standard.” He also describes a “lack of emotional restraint” in the Quintet, which Cooper considers removes the work from the French tradition, thus: “betraying the Germanic affinities of his genius.” Cooper is equally critical of the chromaticism characteristic of much of Franck’s output, reserving his praise for Les Eolides, the Violin Sonata and the String
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Quartet. Cooper sees these works as imbued with the spirits of Liszt and Beethoven. Despite his critique, Cooper considers that Franck has had quite an effect on the development of French music:

[Franck’s] mature passion for Beethoven led him to conceive of all music as primarily an expression of soul, a philosophy of life, in his case half-Christian and half-romantic but wholly emotional. It is in the light of these extreme opposites that we must view . . . the subsequent reaction against his music, which had such a large place in determining the direction of French musical development.64

Cooper considers this effect largely due to Franck’s pupils and the compositional paths they trod following Franck’s death – as well as, perhaps, their fervent devotion to their teacher and mentor: “In all [of Franck’s pupils] there lived on, under varying forms, something of Franck’s idealism, something of his careful, loving and slightly gauche craftsmanship.”65

Davies, however, reminds us that much of the criticism that Franck endured in his life was not without reason, and urges us to not forget it:

The early testimonials he received – like the reviews of his first concerts – should not be dismissed as so much insensitive verbiage. They provide a valuable clue to some of the composer’s cardinal weaknesses, and tell us, quite as clearly as any sociological analysis, why he met with such stiff opposition. Throughout his life Franck was subjected to moderate – and frequently immoderate – criticism, not just in his capacity as an executant, but in everything that he did. That some of this was motivated by spite is obvious. But it would be disingenuous to imply that a fair proportion did not reflect real deficiencies on his part.66

Franck seems to have been ambivalent to this criticism. Accounts of the first performance of Franck’s Symphony report that he seemed unperturbed by the
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reception – his pupils regarded it to be poor – instead commenting on how pleased he was with the sound of the work.\textsuperscript{67}

Few people have written about Franck without agenda: to sanctify him or to berate the sanctifiers. It is easy to put too much weight on biographical aspects of a composer, but it is the aim of this chapter to set the scene for the later analysis rather than provide the basis of it. For now, we might explain the polarity of views regarding Franck and his works by the wider context in which he lived and worked.

It is now pertinent to examine the issue of Franck’s nationality, and how it might inform arguments within this thesis.

**Franck’s Position in French Music**

The importance of nationality depends on how much weight we place on Franck as a defender of the French tradition, and it is a thorny issue. Franck did spend almost his entire working life in Paris, and applied for French nationality when he was appointed professor at the Conservatoire. Rollin Smith describes him as a “Parisian musician in that, from the age of sixteen, he lived in Paris. But he was not a French musician and this has always been a source of annoyance to the natives.”\textsuperscript{68} “Is it really French,” Jean-Aubry asked, “this mysticism, this readiness to take everything seriously?”\textsuperscript{69} Yet the circle of pupils he attracted later in life represents some of the strongest defenders and representatives of the French tradition. Even if we do consider Franck a more “Germanic” influence than French, Lawrence Davies is correct in observing that “the dominance of German culture was hardly

\textsuperscript{67} Brown and Hart, *The Symphonic Repertoire Volume III Part B: The European Symphony from ca. 1800 to ca. 1930: Great Britain, Russia, and France*, 610.
\textsuperscript{68} Smith, *Playing the Organ Works of César Franck*, 1.
\textsuperscript{69} Jean-Aubry, quoted in Davies, *César Franck and His Circle*, 205.
something that resulted from the work of a few accidental expatriates.” 70

Ultimately, Franck was from a mixed background and drew a great deal on great Teutonic composers; yet he worked in Paris for nearly all of his life, influencing an entire generation of French composers. Disagreements regarding his prime nationality continue to this day, and become even more important when considering the Franco-Prussian war and the Commune.

Few Parisians were unaffected by the War. Many of Franck’s pupils played a part in defending Paris, and Franck himself volunteered, despite being almost fifty years old.71 Yet beyond the physical effects, the impact the War and the Commune had on the French cultural spirit was immeasurable and dramatic. “Its impact was so drastic and purifying,” wrote Davies, “as to transform the entire fabric of French culture, proposing a new set of goals for both society and the artist.”72 Richard Anthony Leonard reiterates by stating: “There is no mystery about the after-effect of the Franco-Prussian War of 1870. Following that humiliating defeat the entire French nation underwent a catharsis. . . [and] Revolt against the existing order was nowhere more strongly motivated than in the arts.”73

It is in light of these historical conditions that we must consider Franck’s nationality; born in Liége to a German mother and a father from Gemmenich,74 a town in eastern Belgium close to the modern border with Germany and the Netherlands.75 At the time, the Prince-Bishopric of Liege was part of the United Kingdom of the Netherlands, formed by the Congress of Vienna in 1815. In August 1830 the Belgian Revolution occurred, and in July 1831 Belgium became an independent nation. From these changing political arrangements, Franck was born
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Dutch, became Belgian, and later, in 1871, applied for French citizenship. French was his first language, but he continued to speak German to his mother until she died.\textsuperscript{76} This would not necessarily be important if Franck had lived in the modern European Union, but in the period 1870 to 1890 it was important indeed because of the intense nationalism and rivalry between France and Germany.

The \textit{Société Nationale} formed in February 1871, one month after the armistice ending the Franco-Prussian War.\textsuperscript{77} Its aim was to: “encourage the composition and performance of ‘serious’ French music.”\textsuperscript{78} Franck attended the first meeting, as did Saint-Saëns, Fauré, Bussine, Castillon and Dubois, among others.\textsuperscript{79} The founding charter promotes the composition of works that “reveal elevated and artistic aspirations,” and the revival of concert music in France would indeed owe much to the \textit{Société}.\textsuperscript{80} There exist mixed views, however, on whether this promotion of French music was actually anti-German. One Saint-Saëns biographer describes the \textit{Société} as “a stick with which to beat what [Saint-Saëns] saw as the continuing German influence on French musical life”, \textsuperscript{81} but this position seems to be overstated and contrasts strongly with the views of other members of the group who idolised Wagner, Liszt and Schumann.\textsuperscript{82} At the same time, outside the realms of the \textit{Société Nationale}, there existed a small but “highly vocal group of musical conservatives” who proclaimed that “to detest Prussia was to love France.”\textsuperscript{83} They

\begin{itemize}
\item Smith, \textit{Playing the Organ Works of César Franck}, 1.
\item Ibid.
\item Jean Gallois, ”Chausson, Ernest.” \textit{Grove Music Online. Oxford Music Online.}
\item Brown and Hart, \textit{The Symphonic Repertoire Volume III Part B: The European Symphony from ca. 1800 to ca. 1930: Great Britain, Russia, and France}, 563.
\item Strasser, ”The Société Nationale and Its Adversaries: The Musical Politics of ‘L’invasion Germanique’ in the 1870’s,” 226.
\item Ibid.
\item Ibid., 241.
\end{itemize
professed that this new “music of the future” – which influenced most Société members – was “as threatening to France’s artistic heritage as German industrialisation was to her security.” These conservative and nationalist ideas were often professed by Gaston Escudier in his journal L’Art musical; in 1872, when the Société was beginning to attract attention, a scathing front page article labeled the Société a “fervent cult for Richard Wagner and for neo-German music,” and more viciously suggested that if a member “commits, even by chance, the error of writing a truly melodic phrase, [he] will be forthwith expelled. . . . Death to melody! Death to genius!” Such attacks persisted throughout the decade; in 1875 a critic reported on a recent Société concert: “We were saturated with music more or less of the future; that is to say; nebulous chromaticism was feted with idolatry.”

However, the Société viewed the “music of the future” as positive and forward-looking. In an 1876 review of Wagner’s Ring at Bayreuth, Saint-Saëns praised the immensity of Wagner’s accomplishment and noted that it received an enthusiastic reception. He then labeled those who protested the music had “no melody” or was “difficult to understand” as having their heads buried in the sand, and stated that: “the advance of art was impossible to stop and that Wagner’s operas were being played everywhere, not only in Germany, but in Russia, England, Italy, and America.” He also explained later that it was the duty of French composers to “study new techniques”; despite Wagner’s bad press in same quarters, the Société composers were intrigued by his innovations, as well as by the music of Schumann.
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and Liszt. The Société members professed they did not wish to exclude the music of other composers, but rather promote a more serious musical style that was “worthy of a great nation”, which in itself suggests the presence of competing nationalisms.

The criticisms from Escudier continued, however, and by 1880 Saint-Saëns felt compelled to defend the Société for its perceived intolerance toward those outside their circle. “The members come together on one point only,” said Saint-Saëns: “the cult of serious music, and separate on all others.” Strasser notes a great deal of diversity in the Société’s concert programs, but the critics’ problems seem to be with “seriousness” of music, aiming to elevate rather than amuse, and, to some, this seemed a very “German” attitude to take. By the 1880s the Société seemed to have become less of a forum for new music and more of an instrument “for the renewal of French society through the promotion of ‘serious’ music”: in other words, a quasi-political vehicle rather than an encouraging compositional forum. However, although the composers of the Société wished to create a distinctive French style, they suffered criticism from conservatives for drawing on German techniques and ideals. Such conservatives labeled the Société as a haven for those who professed Germanic sympathies, and this view was to intensify in the coming years.

Despite Saint-Saëns’ 1880 defence, by 1886 both he and Bussine, the two principal founders of the Société, had resigned. Strasser explains:

[Their resignation] revolved precisely around the growing influences of Wagner’s most fervent admirers, many of whom were also pupils of César Franck.
Composers . . . who had once defended the controversial German master and insisted that French musicians should welcome fresh ideas from any quarter, came to fear the impact that Wagner’s music was having on both the public and young French composers. . . Franck’s young disciples eventually caused many of the Société’s less adventurous members to leave the organization.  

Although Franck was elected President of the Société Nationale that same year, it is difficult to tell how much of this fervent Wagnerian attitude can be attributed to him. It seems more likely that this attitude came from his enthusiastic disciples – though it seems unlikely that they would have followed this path without Franck’s tacit approval.  

Nevertheless, following Franck’s election to the Société Nationale Presidency, the Société concerts allowed German works to be performed alongside French.

There seems to be no “correct” answer to Franck’s nationality; indeed, he seems most cosmopolitan. Despite working in Paris and influencing a generation of composers who were French, his musical influences were, in the broadest sense, predominantly German. Perhaps attempting to delineate any further is counter-productive – we know Franck’s background – and this thesis hopes to illuminate that which might be considered novel and that which might, in a technical or constructive sense, be considered derived from the Germanic tradition of the time.

The following section introduces Franck’s influences and style, as well as the works that will prove most fruitful for detailed analysis.

______________________
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Influences and Style

“Inliszt has the richest musical imagination of our time. His works whether for piano or for orchestra, are a mine of melodic and harmonic treasures.”

– César Franck

Liszt was an enormous influence on Franck from the first *Trios concertants* that he purchased and suggested changes to, as previously discussed. These Trios foreshadow the cyclic procedures that were to become commonplace in Franck’s later works. However, it is important to differentiate between Franck’s cyclicism and other formal innovations that were gaining popularity during this period, the most famous being those of Berlioz’ *Symphonie Fantastique*. In this work, Berlioz uses an obsessive idea – an *idée fixe* – in all five movements of his programmatic Symphony. However, this technique differs from cyclic procedures in that it is present in all the movements and used obsessively, its rhythm and mood altered each time to fit the programmatic context. In a more straightforward cyclic form, a composer recalls a theme or themes from preceding movements in the finale. This differs from a theme being reused and reworked in all movements, and such restatements are most often used in non-programmatic works. Furthermore, cyclicism usually only becomes apparent in the finale, as opposed to appearing throughout the entire work (though there are exceptions to this).

With Beethoven’s recall of themes in the Ninth symphony (1824), Schubert’s “Wanderer” Fantasy (1823) and Schumann’s Piano Quintet (1842), by 1843 there were certainly precedents for cyclic procedures. Despite this, d’Indy suggests that Franck’s Trios initiated Liszt’s interest in cyclicism:

> How this young pupil of the Paris Conservatoire came to conceive the idea of constructing an important work upon the basis of a single theme, concurrent with other melodies which also reappear in the course of the work, thus creating a
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musical cycle – a form which Liszt alone foresaw without ever arriving at a perfect development of it.\textsuperscript{99}

Although Liszt developed cyclic and thematic procedures in a far more sophisticated manner than Franck, it is unlikely we will ever know which composer first conceptualised cyclic form; it may even have been neither Franck nor Liszt, but someone else entirely.\textsuperscript{100}

An obvious similarity between the two composers is their genres of choice. Both wrote solo piano and organ music and a number of Symphonic poems (though Liszt wrote his primarily during the 1850s.) One such poem of Franck’s, \textit{Le chasseur maudit}, makes a fascinating tonal study, and a useful precedent for later works as it employs “active” key relationships – those of minor thirds – which contrast with the subdominant axial emphasis in the first section, related by major thirds. \textit{Le chasseur maudit} implies an awareness of tonal relationships as agents of drama; a function that Liszt (among others) exploited in harmonic schemes of many of his works. Franck’s \textit{Prélude choral et fugue} for piano demands formal comparison with Liszt’s epic B minor Sonata. Trevitt notes that the \textit{Prélude, choral et fugue}’s “chromatic generating motif (later becoming the fugue subject) further emphasises [Franck’s] underlying relationship to the music of Liszt.”\textsuperscript{101} He also discusses how Liszt influenced Franck’s musical idiom, particularly in the piano works.\textsuperscript{102}
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works unify a multi-movement sonata into a continuous musical cycle; Franck making use of cyclic form (here defined as the recall of themes unaltered) and Liszt of thematic transformation (here defined as recall of themes that are recognisable but altered). Moreover, both works use an axial tonal scheme, which I will discuss in more detail in Chapter Two.

Wagner must rank highly among the other important influences on Franck’s musical style. By 1873 Franck had heard Lohengrin, Tannhäuser and Die Walküre, though Duparc described Franck’s reaction to the last Opera as: “tepid”.103 In 1874 Franck heard the Prélude to Tristan for the first time, and James Briscoe describes how “Franck . . . treasured his copy of [Tristan und Isolde] without seeing fit to remove the word ‘poison’ he had early scrawled on the title page.”104 Though he never made the pilgrimage to Bayreuth, Wagner’s harmonic language undoubtedly affected him. Some works after this date bear aspects of Wagner’s expanded tonality, including Les Eolides, the Prélude, Choral et Fugue and a quotation in the String Quartet, though the extent to which the chromaticism might have been learned from other sources is difficult to tell.

Yet, Franck’s music does seem to have become more chromatic as he matured; Trevitt notes that “a very rich strain of chromaticism is indeed a consistent feature of his mature works.”105 However, indications of rich chromaticism are also present in works that pre-date 1874, when Franck first encountered Wagner’s prelude to Tristan.106 We must remember, however, that Franck did not make the type of harmonic advances we attribute to Wagner, Brahms, Liszt or Debussy. According to Davies, Franck:

103 Davies, César Franck and His Circle, 207.
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lacked culture and that sort of intellectual vision of his art which modern critics rate as indispensable.107 One would have thought [that Wagner and Franck] had much in common, especially in view of their chromatic leaning. But it is quite likely that Franck never really grasped what Wagner was trying to do with the language of music.108

This charge demands exploration. Though there is truth in the statement “Wagner was to explore the association of much more distantly related harmonies [than Franck did]”, this does not mean that Franck’s harmonic idiom is immature or underdeveloped – instead, when examined closely, it presents a different internal logic from that valued and utilised by Wagner. This is not least because Franck wrote predominantly absolute music – he did attempt several operas, but these were not his prime focus (Vallas suggests they were composed to appease his wife, who encouraged Franck to pursue any venture she thought might be commercially successful109) and the harmonic requirements of a Music-Drama composer and that of a writer of symphonic poems and chamber music may well be different. Both composers may be building with similar materials, but the inner frameworks are incomparable. This is why Franck compares more easily to Liszt; their genres of choice are more homogenous.

It is also important to consider exactly what the term “chromaticism” entails. Though in a simple sense the term refers to any note outside a given key, by the late nineteenth century some out-of-key chords became so common that they were virtually considered diatonic.110 Yet we must somehow also differentiate between largely diatonic works that use chromatic sonorities and works that are more strongly influenced by a chromatic background structure – especially as Franck wrote works representative of both categories. Cohn discusses the appropriateness
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of such terms and suggests that: “’triadic post-tonality’ may be the more appropriate term for the chromatic music of the late nineteenth century.” 111 “Expanded tonality” is also useful in its imagery, conveying an open-ended diatonicism grown to include non-traditional sonorities. As we cannot consider Franck an atonal composer, either term seems appropriate, though “chromaticism” is such a prevalent term in the literature that it is bound to continue to turn up in this thesis. I outline the analytical terms of reference in Chapter Two.

Finally, we must also consider the influence of the Viennese masters, in particular Beethoven. One of Franck’s earliest works, Final from Six Pièces for organ, presents this affect very simply: the opening manual parts are uncannily similar to Beethoven’s Hammerklavier Sonata, Op. 106; furthermore, both are in the key of B-flat. The similarity is mainly from the plagal voice-leading that permeates the opening phrase of each work. Though the works develop differently, Beethoven’s Hammerklavier makes a fascinating study within the axial-tonal paradigm, and is a work we will return to.112

The String Quartet is similarly influenced: unsurprisingly, like others after Beethoven, Franck regarded the genre with “awe and superstition” and, as in the case of Fauré, the presence of only one exemplar in this genre suggests its importance.113 D’Indy reports seeing scores of Bach, Schubert and Beethoven on Franck’s workbench (and it must be noted that this is one of the instances of specific influence that we can point to in Franck).114 Similarities with Beethoven’s E-flat major Quartet Op. 127, in particular, are present; indeed, there is a note
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scrawled in the margin of the finale: “A new phrase needed here; see the E flat quartet of Beethoven, Op. 127.” Furthermore, in the first movement, Franck’s use of a slow “Lied” theme in conjunction with an Allegro is similar to Beethoven’s alternation of Maestoso and Allegro in the first movement of the E-flat Quartet Op. 127. Franck was also fond of the “Beethoven’s Ninth” technique of quoting the themes from each movement at the start of the finale, and he does this in the String Quartet as well as in the Grande Pièce Symphonique. Though such techniques may seem contrived to our modern ears, this does not negate the very real influence Beethoven and his predecessors had on Franck. This may have been part of Franck’s charm, as it were: Trevitt suggests that,

To his pupils, Franck communicated both the Beethoven idealism inherent in the cultivation of the strict genres of symphony, quartet and sonata and the harmonic innovations of late Romanticism. This double allegiance to the Viennese tradition on the one hand, and to Liszt and Wagner on the other, was undoubtedly responsible for the self-indulgent massiveness which characterizes many Franckist works. This “massiveness” may be characteristic, but it also proves problematic, particularly when its effect seems “staged” as Dahlhaus suggests. I examine the Symphony in more detail in Chapter Eight.

As well as the important influences of composers, it is apt to note some stylistic features of Franck’s that appeared from an early age (that we might describe as “influences of personality”) and others that may have developed because of his instrument, the organ. One of Franck’s first professors, Zimmerman, commented that Franck possessed an “over-ardent manner of expression”. Alongside this, Davies suggests that Franck’s intelligence “did not seem equal to his musical
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gifts.”

“He lacked self-criticism”, Davies explains, and he is often described as the “organ-loft composer”. An examiner of Franck’s in an early test described his improvisation as “a little vague and monotonous.”

Similarly, an early reviewer described the harmonies of his improvisation as “reminiscent of Fingal’s cave”, but lamented that Franck “did not end soon enough.”

Indeed, part of Liszt’s suggestion to reverse the finales of two of Franck’s early Trios was because he thought the finale of the third was too long and constituted a work within itself.

Though it is desirable to write off these descriptions as youthful immaturity, it seems that Franck had a penchant for long improvisations his entire life. An account by Pierné, a pupil of Franck’s and his successor at St-Clotilde, describes the length of Franck’s improvisations:

The curé of Sainte-Clotilde had first installed a little bell in the blower room. When this little bell rang, it meant: “Monsieur Franck, by order of the curé, stop!” But M. Franck, absorbed, did not hear the little bell. Then they put in a louder electric bell. That one Le Père Franck heard (he couldn’t do otherwise) but then he would exclaim, “I never have time to return to the correct key.” And, unruffled, he modulated, following the rules, in order to come back to the original key . . . the good curé of Sainte-Clotilde, after having opened and closed his breviary several times, always hoping to hear the final chord, got up and went himself to the maîtrise to give two or three imperious rings. Then he confirmed his order by sending a chorister up to the organ. But Franck didn’t stop.

This story effectively illustrates the difficulty Franck had in completing his improvisations in a timely fashion, a difficulty that some argue is also inherent in many of his compositions. Despite this problem, however, improvisation can also lead to inspiration, and may lend itself positively to his work. Emory Fanning
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writes that improvisation “accounts for the character of his melodic extension and development, thematic expansion in which an incidental fragment or motive is made the constituent of a new phrase.” 125 Trevor also discusses how Franck creates thematic material in this way: “Often Franck developed complex phrase structures using a kind of mosaic of variants of one or two germinal motifs, a technique which again underlines his indebtedness to Liszt.”126 I discuss these features more fully later in the thesis, but at this point it is pertinent to look at some of Franck’s broader compositional characteristics.

There are several features of Franck’s architectural principles that require discussion: cyclic form; the blending of movements to create unity; and his unusual tonal schemes.

Cyclic form is a technique commonly associated with Franck, referring to the quotations from earlier movements in the finales of the Symphony, String Quartet and other works. However, recent scholarship has begun to grapple with how we might actually define cyclic form and related techniques including thematic transformation, ideé fixe, leitmotif, and thematic reminiscence. Walter Frisch quotes Hugh Macdonald’s New Grove article: “cyclic form”, in the “strictest sense” is most often used to describe “works where thematic links bind more than one movement; it is not properly applied to mere thematic resemblances.” 127 The “Thematic Transformation” entry by the same author describes it as: “A term used to define the process of modifying a theme so that in a new context it is different but yet manifestly made of the same elements.” 128 Yet, Frisch points out that “propriety is hard to establish in other contexts: one analyst’s ‘mere thematic

126 Trevor and Fauquet, "César Franck."
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resemblance’ may be another’s ‘thematic link.’”129 Furthermore, at what point do such instances constitute a cyclic form? In his 2006 thesis on Mendelssohn’s instrumental music, Benedict Taylor suggests that “‘Cyclic form’ . . . is a vague and ambiguous term which incorporates many differing definitions.”130 He observes that in previous literature “any work in which music from a previous movement is recalled and reused in a later one can be termed ‘cyclic’. Thus, in itself, thematic affinity between movements of a work – even possibly an ongoing development and resolution – should strictly speaking not really warrant the epithet ‘cyclic’.”131 His eventual definition, which he uses to examine Mendelssohn’s music in the later chapters of his thesis, is as follows:

Cyclicism, with regard to musical form, entails at the very least close thematic affinity between movements or, more properly, explicit recall of music from one in another. These two types can be designated transformative and recalling cyclicism. To insist on a division between these two would be problematic, since the boundaries can be blurred between what constitutes close allusion and literal reprise. Moreover, many works which recall past movements tend to feature such thematic interconnections; cyclicism would be seen as a continuum of possibilities between these two types.132

Many of Franck’s works display instances of both transformative and recalling cyclicism, from the Op. 1 Trios concertants to the piano works, Violin Sonata, String Quartet, Symphony and organ Chorals.133 The motivation behind the idea is understandable: such techniques are one way to create unity in a large work. In some of Franck’s pieces the effect is convincing, or at least continued presence in the repertoire would seem to suggest, such as in the Violin Sonata. Here, themes from the first movement are parodied in the second and recur in the third and
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fourth, but do not sound contrived. Elsewhere, such as in the Symphony, the recall of previous themes in the last movement sounds awkward: the haunting Cor Anglais melody from the second movement is paraded oddly by the brass in the third, whilst the return of the first theme in the same movement requires a clumsy tempo shift.\textsuperscript{134} Perhaps it was this that motivated Camille Bellaigue to write: “what [Franck] takes to be unity and cohesion could well be nothing but aridity and poverty.”\textsuperscript{135} It is important to note, however, that Franck’s cyclicism is not thematic transformation by another name. The latter technique, associated with Liszt, is more sophisticated, describing a theme that undergoes change in the course of a work. The effect is similar to that of cyclic recall, but with the advantage of being able to be altered providing its identity is preserved, meaning a programme – such as “darkness to light” – can be underscored by changes in the theme, such as the oft-cited Third Symphony of Saint-Saëns.

Another formal principle common in Franck’s works is the amalgamation of several movements into one, or the creation of one movement with several sections of varying character. Examples include Grande Pièce Symphonique, the solo piano works, the symphonic poems, Variations symphoniques and the Trois Chorals. Such unification is not peculiar to Franck: many of Liszt’s Symphonic poems also do this and the B minor Sonata is an oft-cited example; in the realm of “absolute” Symphonic music Schumann uses the technique in his fourth Symphony\textsuperscript{136}, and Saint-Saëns unified movements 1 – 2 and 3 – 4 of his Third Symphony. The second movement of Franck’s Symphony is particularly innovative, however: featuring a “telescoped” Scherzo framed by two slow sections of equal length. This suggests a concern for form that persevered well into Franck’s career.

\textsuperscript{134} Brown and Hart, The Symphonic Repertoire Volume III Part B: The European Symphony from ca. 1800 to ca. 1930: Great Britain, Russia, and France, 610.
\textsuperscript{135} Ibid., 609.
\textsuperscript{136} Taylor, “Cyclic Forms in the Instrumental Music of Felix Mendelssohn: Time, Memory and Musical History”, 12.
The final aspect of Franck’s style that I consider now is his tonal architecture. This is the foremost focus of this thesis; here, I present several ideas, which I will expound in later chapters. Consider the following comments made about Franck’s Symphony in D minor by a reviewer in *Le Temps*: “M. Franck sins by an excess of enthusiasm: in wanting to do too much, he has made his work dull and has abused chromatic progressions to a singular degree.”¹³⁷ Furthermore, Ambroise Thomas, from the Conservatoire, supposedly asked: “What is a symphony in D minor whose first theme is in D-flat at the ninth measure, C-flat at the tenth, F-sharp minor at the twenty first, C minor at the twenty sixth, E-flat at the thirty ninth and F-minor at the forty ninth?”¹³⁸ Though these keys are temporary or sequential modulations rather than significant centers, Thomas’ grievance – the incessant chromatic modulation within Franck’s Symphony – remains relevant, and I consider this in Chapter Eight.

It is interesting that Schubert, Liszt and others employ similar tonal discursiveness without attracting the same level of criticism. There are a number of possible reasons why Franck’s reception has been so mixed: perhaps his music was misunderstood (in which case analysis might inform us better about internal structures therein); or perhaps such a mixed reception is symptomatic of the time, as Franck’s structure may be also. Further study will explore both possibilities. What is most important is that something in Franck’s tonality is unusual; there is more than chromaticism at work, and there is more than chromaticism to be concerned with. The analysis, Chapters Five to Nine, reveals a deeper coherence behind the discursiveness in the music of Franck and others. The task of this thesis is to see whether a similar approach to Frank’s work reveals something similar or profoundly different.

¹³⁸ Ibid.
It seems inconclusive to state that Franck “did not understand what Wagner was doing”\textsuperscript{139} or “A very rich strain of chromaticism is indeed a consistent feature of his mature works.”\textsuperscript{140} Why this chromaticism, and why this tonal discursiveness? Only closer analysis of Franck and his predecessors will tell if there is something deeper beneath the surface. I examine six works from Franck’s late period in detail: \textit{Le chasseur maudit} and \textit{Psyché} (Symphonic Poems), the Quintet, the String Quartet, the Symphony and the Violin Sonata. I will refer to other works peripherally as necessary. These works demonstrate an internal logic of tonal architecture, elucidating Franck’s internal structures and considerations.

Before this analysis can begin, however, it is necessary to trace the origin of the ideas about tonal organisation that may be relevant to Franck. The next chapter – part two of the literature review – considers literature regarding axial tonality.

\textsuperscript{139} Davies, \textit{Paths to Modern Music}, 14.
\textsuperscript{140} Trevitt and Fauquet, “César Franck.”
This section of the literature review is primarily concerned with Riemann and Neo-Riemann analysis. Cohn writes that “Neo-Riemann theory arose in response to analytical problems posed by chromatic music that is triadic but not altogether tonally unified.” 141 He quotes Rothstein’s analysis of Wagner’s music:

Some phrases . . . are not true phrases at all from a tonal point of view because they do not contain a single coherent tonal motion. Such phrases . . . must be said to cross the hazy line separating tonality from post-tonality (or whatever one wishes to call triadic but post-tonal practice).142 Although some of Franck’s music is purely diatonic (such as some of the Six Pieces), some works seem to cohere to other principles or not at all – to “cross the hazy line”, as it were. Sections from the Symphony, String Quartet and Symphonic Poem Psyché belong to this category. This is the type of music that Cohn is concerned with when he asks “if this music is not fully coherent according to the principles of diatonic tonality, by what other principles might it cohere?”143 Riemann, Neo-Riemann and related types of analysis offer insight into ways that such coherence might be described. These types of analysis are concerned with how systems that divide the octave equally might form coherent modulatory patterns; within this, the intervals of major and minor

142 Ibid., 168.
143 Ibid., 169.
thirds become significant in their ability to divide an octave equally. Many writers examined here are interested in properties of major-third related keys in particular and their potential for functional equivalence.

This literature review is primarily concerned with two questions. Firstly, what evidence is there to suggest that major-third relatives can be functionally equivalent, in terms of both chord to chord motion and large-scale key relationships? Secondly, to what extent can such progressions or structures be incorporated into a framework that is still largely governed by diatonic principles? To answer these questions, this chapter begins with a survey of Hugo Riemann’s analytical insights, as he was one of the first – and arguably most significant – to articulate harmonic function theory. As function is so integral to our analysis, it is necessary to examine Riemann’s work first. His writings draw on the work of Rameau, Reicha, Weber, A.B. Marx and Hauptmann, among others. From these he draws a dualist theory which privileges third-relationships, and in the past three decades his ideas have piqued the interest of modern analysts. The most important of these will be examined in this chapter: Daniel Harrison, Richard Cohn, Graeme Downes and David Kopp all contribute to the elucidation, updating and expanded application of Riemann’s ideas. The synthesis of these ideas will form my analytical method, to be used in my analysis of musical works in subsequent chapters. The aim is a representation of tonal events that accurately describes the listener’s experience and the composer’s intention. As Lewin writes: “The task of the analyst is ‘merely’ to point out things in the piece that strike him as characteristic and important (where by ‘things’ one includes complex relationships), and to arrange his presentation in a way that will stimulate the musical imagination of his audience.”

Key

Hugo Riemann (1849 – 1919)

One of Riemann’s first writings was “Musikalische Logik” (1874), an early treatise and adaption of his doctoral dissertation. Despite not addressing harmonic function specifically, Riemann treats Hauptmann’s ideas in a way that might be considered prophetic. Riemann describes Hauptmann as having “well understood the unity of chords within a key” but criticises him for not addressing “the different meaning of these chords to each other, about their logical meaning in musical composition.”¹⁴⁵ Though the word “function” is not used, Harrison points out that “logical meaning” might be considered a synonym to Funktionsbezeichnung (which can be translated as “function indicator”¹⁴⁶), describing the idea as a “constant red thread” throughout Riemann’s career,¹⁴⁷ and signifying his ideas about harmonic function may have been brewing as early as 1872. In Skizze einer neuen Methode der Harmonielehre (1880), dedicated to Franz Liszt,¹⁴⁸ Riemann presented the idea of dualism: major and minor being mirror images of one another, generating mirror image systems. By this Riemann is referring to the conception of the dominant triad being built above the tonic triad, and the subdominant triad inverted below, like so:

Figure 2.1: Hauptmann’s diagram of keys¹⁴⁹

\[
F - a - C - e - G - b - D
\]

Subdominant | Tonic | Dominant

¹⁴⁶ Translation by K. Yelavich, 2011.
¹⁴⁷ Harrison, Harmonic Function in Chromatic Music, 266.
¹⁴⁸ Ibid., 274.
This is a borrowing of Hauptmann’s diagram from the treatise *Die Natur der Harmonik und der Metrik* of 1853. Riemann discusses the importance of “directed intervals between . . . roots” when defining a key: “In a work: Key is nothing greater that the meaning of a chord in relation to its tonic. The key is left as soon as this meaning changes, which can happen without the introduction of a chromatic tone. The modern name for this notion of key is: *Tonalität.*” But as we might expect, not all root-interval progressions are equal in power and clarity. Riemann outlines the progressions which he considers the most intelligible; that is, those that present “direct opposition” without endangering the key: these include fifth relations, third relations, and some step progressions. So whilst Riemann does not describe mediants as tonic or dominant substitutes, he does state (in Kopp’s words) that, “like the dominants, chromatic mediants are a separate type of progression which may support meaningful key relation to the tonic.” In supporting this meaningful key relation, Riemann suggests that chromatic chords should not be considered borrowings from other keys, but as related to the *Tonalität.*

Some of these ideas begin to change in Riemann’s next treatise, the *Systematische Modulationslehre* published in 1887. Here, Riemann is beginning to think more in terms of harmonic function and a cadential model of harmony. He shortens the list of keys that enjoy “close relation” to the tonic: now, in C, the keys would be the minors C, A and E; and the major keys G, F, E and A-flat majors (notice how this list includes both major third relations to the tonic). This illustrates Riemann’s belief that the two most important relations to a tonic were a fifth and a major third, further reinforced by the inclusion of a grid
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representing fifth relations horizontally, major third relations vertically and minor third relations diagonally.\textsuperscript{156}

**Figure 2. 2: Riemann’s early *Tonnetz*\textsuperscript{157}**

Riemann also discusses how chromatic mediants might best be incorporated into a musical work. Parallels between what Riemann discusses here and the works analysed later in this thesis are striking, and pose the question whether a major third related key can sustain direct harmonic motion. Riemann writes:

> This question is to be answered with an unconditional yes . . . The principal meaning of third relations at its clearest and most indisputable stands out when, in cyclic forms (sonatas, symphonies), a free-standing middle section in a third-related key is set against [the tonic], or also when a second theme of a movement enters in such a key. If E and A-flat major are understandable and in excellent relation to (or rather in between) C major, then there is only a single explanation, that a connection by third relations is to be understood between the two tonics. Marx also puzzled over why it is that E major and A-flat major seem less foreign than D major and B-flat major.\textsuperscript{158}

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{156} Ibid., 76 – 78.
  \item \textsuperscript{157} Ibid., 77.
  \item \textsuperscript{158} Ibid., 81.
\end{itemize}
Riemann’s writings will be discussed further in the section regarding chords. For now, more recent writing on third-related keys will be examined.

**Other analysts**

Graeme Downes’ 1994 thesis on Progressive Tonality in Mahler’s music asks why “composers favoured some tonal areas over others despite the equal availability afforded by an increasingly chromatic harmonic language.” For example, $\flat III$ is a common second tonal area in minor key works, as it seems to articulate the expected opposition of sonata form. However, the opposite relationship (I—vi) is much less common, which suggests that composers simply found this relationship less useful. Stating that “if we find that several keys relate to the tonic in the same way then we can justify the notion of an axial system”, Downes demonstrates which voice-leading steps are necessary to define a tonic and how those with similar characteristics interrelate. This concept relates specifically to Riemann’s ideas about which chords were capable of conveying “tonic”, and there is certainly much overlap between the systems. Downes refers to this as an “axis system” and outlines it thus, relative to the tonic of C:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subdominant</th>
<th>Tonic</th>
<th>Dominant</th>
<th>Supertonic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IV$\alpha$ A</td>
<td>I$\alpha$</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>V$\alpha$ B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV F</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV$\beta$ D flat</td>
<td>I$\beta$</td>
<td>A flat</td>
<td>V$\beta$ E flat</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This table can be considered one of both chords and keys; as Downes states,
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Tovey describes tonality as being a “... long-range view of harmony”. It naturally follows that each level is governed by the same rules, so that, for example, a chord of the dominant seeks resolution in the same way that any passage “on” or “in” the dominant key seeks resolution to the tonic key.\textsuperscript{161}

However, to justify this capacity for functional equivalence, we must break down the tonicisation process into constituent elements: that is, voice-leading elements which tonicise. The common denominator is that of a major third – each major third above the tonic is labelled I\textalpha, and the major third below the tonic I\textbeta. Downes describes how chords which share efficiency of voice leading to the tonic, dominant and subdominant can relate to and substitute for one another.\textsuperscript{162} If the triads in the table are observed vertically, we can see that such chords are those related by major third. He explains that in this context, for a chord to function as a dominant, it must either feature a leading note (with the resolution by upward rising semitone) or a perfect wholetone (with the resolution by an upward rising whole tone).\textsuperscript{163} Downes describes dominant and subdominant functions in this way:

\begin{figure}
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|l|}
\hline
\textbf{Dominant functions} \\
Leading note – resolution by upward rising semitone \\
Perfect wholetone – resolution by upward rising whole tone \\
\hline
\textbf{Subdominant functions} \\
plagal leading note – resolution by falling semitone \\
plagal wholetone – resolution by falling tone\textsuperscript{164} \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\caption{Downes’ dominant/subdominant functions}
\end{figure}

\textsuperscript{161} Ibid., 14.
\textsuperscript{162} Ibid., 18.
\textsuperscript{163} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{164} Ibid.
Therefore if we are in the key of C, B can function as a dominant with its upward rising semitone from B – C and E-flat can function as a dominant with its upward rising whole tone from B-flat – C. Similarly, chords with a subdominant function feature a plagal leading note (resolution by falling semitone) or a plagal whole tone (resolution by falling tone). If substitution occurs, we can label such sonorities as “axial dominants” and “axial subdominants,” and, similarly, such progressions as “axial progressions.”

Such progressions on the small scale also hold true when extended works modulate to larger areas. However, this must be qualified: despite being able to “read” axial relationships into a large amount of music, there are, of course, other ways in which keys relate which are sometimes more pertinent. For example, some analyses in this thesis feature whole tone relationships, though axial “readings” may be possible. The question we must ask ourselves is whether we hear a substitute dominant or subdominant, or an extension of the dominant or subdominant area. Often the answer is yes, but if it is not – or it is unclear – then we must seek alternate explanations. So, enlightening though the axial system is, we must beware of applying it to works that may be operating under different frameworks.

Nevertheless, Downes correctly states that the compositional aims of nineteenth-century composers “enforce[d] the avoidance of the cadential structures that dominated the Classical period.” Works which might be said to avoid traditional cadential structures – or where V – I cadences are avoided in favour of other cadential motion – certainly include the first movement of Franck’s Violin Sonata, Beethoven’s E-flat Major Quartet Op. 127, the first movement of the Hammerklavier Sonata, and the first movement of Brahms’ third Symphony. In these and similar cases, linear concerns became more
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important: “cadences less emphatic than the traditional perfect cadence had the
advantage of being able to define the tonic without disrupting continuity.”

What is most significant about this proposed axis system is the premise that
third-related keys will exhibit “a degree of neutrality or functional equivalence
based on the premise that tonality is a deeper structural level application of the
harmonic laws of the foreground.”

Figure 2.5: Dominant voice-leading efficiency (adapted from Downes)

Here I illustrate the Dominant voice leadings, and I have added VLE, which
refers to voice-leading efficiency, as illustrated by Cohn in “Maximally Smooth
Cycles”. Downes writes: “The most important tonic defining motion is the
leading note, which is common to all axis members hence justifying the axis
status of these keys on melodic grounds”, and further, “Naturally many
(though not all) of these progressions are rare . . . as actual cadences. But they
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Gustav Mahler and Nineteenth Century Antecedents”, 21.
do appear at the deeper structural levels.”\(^\text{172}\) It follows that structural dominant-axis progressions are those which utilise leading-note and other dominant voice-leadings; subdominant-axis structural progressions are those which utilise subdominant voice-leadings.

**Figure 2.6: Subdominant voice-leading efficiency (adapted from Downes\(^\text{173}\))**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IV - I (VLE 3)</th>
<th>iv - I (VLE 4)</th>
<th>IV - i (VLE 2)</th>
<th>iv - i (VLE 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Musical notation" /></td>
<td><img src="image2" alt="Musical notation" /></td>
<td><img src="image3" alt="Musical notation" /></td>
<td><img src="image4" alt="Musical notation" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV - I(\alpha) (VLE 3)</td>
<td>iv - I(\alpha) (VLE 4)</td>
<td>IV - i(\alpha) (VLE 2)</td>
<td>iv - i(\alpha) (VLE 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image5" alt="Musical notation" /></td>
<td><img src="image6" alt="Musical notation" /></td>
<td><img src="image7" alt="Musical notation" /></td>
<td><img src="image8" alt="Musical notation" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV - I(\beta) (VLE 3)</td>
<td>iv - I(\beta) (VLE 4)</td>
<td>IV - i(\beta) (VLE 2)</td>
<td>iv - i(\beta) (VLE 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image9" alt="Musical notation" /></td>
<td><img src="image10" alt="Musical notation" /></td>
<td><img src="image11" alt="Musical notation" /></td>
<td><img src="image12" alt="Musical notation" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Now we will examine the final partitioned group, the “supertonic axis”. This may be a misleading label for this axis group, as “supertonic” implies its specific scale-defined role: dominant preparation. Though key areas or chords from this group may be utilised in this way, it is also possible for them to function as subdominant of the subdominant, or as whole-tone dividers between two tonic axis members.\(^\text{174}\)

\(^{172}\) Ibid., 22.  
\(^{173}\) Ibid., 23.  
\(^{174}\) Ibid., 24.
According to Downes, this can lead to a “more stable tonic axis member”\textsuperscript{176} and hence may be a desirable effect. In the analyses which feature in the following chapters, ‘WT1’ is used to refer to the same whole-tone scale as the tonic when such descriptions are appropriate. When key areas are instead acting as supertonic or otherwise, they will also be notated as such; it is important to note the different ways keys and chords in this axis can function. Downes’ work is compelling in its argument for the ability of an augmented triad to function as the chromatically enhanced dominant to any tonic axis key. This idea will have implications for many of the analyses of later chapters.

It is helpful to examine Downes’ research simultaneously with arguments by Richard Cohn. Cohn identifies the same partitioning system: though the detail and labelling is different to the eye, the keys are grouped together identically. Cohn’s diagram features a map of keys grouped according to their voice leading efficiency, with transitions between neighbouring keys made by one semitone shift. These key groups are labelled Northern (C – E – A flat), Western (G – B – E flat), Eastern (D flat – F – A), and Southern (B flat – D – F sharp). Each

\textsuperscript{175} Ibid., 25.
\textsuperscript{176} Ibid., 24.
of these constitutes a “hexatonic system”, and the grouping of the four as a whole is described as a “hyper-hexatonic system”.\textsuperscript{177} Hexatonic refers to the set-class 6 – 20, which in its prime form is \([0, 1, 4, 5, 8, 9]\), or to give a pitch-class example, \([C, C#, E, F, G#, A]\).\textsuperscript{178} This set-class can be transposed three further times, creating the four hexatonic sets. This concept is examined further later in the chapter, where I link it with Downes’ ideas.

Cohn discusses how complementary regions possess a “capacity [for] motions \textit{between} the cycles to form coherent modulatory patterns.”\textsuperscript{179} In his article “As Wonderful as Star Clusters”, which discusses Schubert’s Piano Sonata D.960 in B-flat, Cohn writes that:

theorists recognized voice-leading efficiency as an alternative basis for harmonic relations already during Schubert’s lifetime and throughout the nineteenth century, but were reluctant to explore its systematic implications, primarily because to do so would have required them to relinquish their deep prior commitment to acoustic theory and tonal centricity, in favour of a less hierarchic, more networked conception of harmonic relations.\textsuperscript{180}

Like Downes, Cohn demonstrates that hexatonic systems are reconcilable with traditional functional principles. This diagram, taken from the same article, shows the keys in each hexatonic system horizontally, demonstrating the efficient voice-leading between triads which are a semitone away from one another enharmonically. The vertical columns represent the traditional view of tonality, presenting chords related by perfect fourths and fifths.

\textsuperscript{177} Cohn, ”Maximally Smooth Cycles, Hexatonic Systems, and the Analysis of Late-Romantic Triadic Progressions,” 23.
\textsuperscript{178} Ibid., 18.
\textsuperscript{179} Ibid., 17.
Figure 2.8: Cohn’s “Table of Tonal Relations”¹⁸¹

\[
\begin{array}{cccccccc}
E\flat + & E\flat - & B + & B - & G + & G - & E\flat + \\
B\flat + & B\flat - & G\flat + & F\flat - & D + & D - & B\flat + \\
F + & F - & D\flat + & C\flat - & A + & A - & F + \\
C + & C - & A\flat + & A\flat - & E + & E - & C + \\
\end{array}
\]

Cohn further discusses how chords within a hexatonic system can be mobilised for the smoothness or edginess of their harmonic progressions. He describes three ways in which chords within an axis relate to one another, and the relative smoothness of each transition:

1. *Adjacent* harmonies, such as the relation of E flat major to E flat minor, involve a single semitonal displacement;
2. *Modally matched* harmonies, such as the relation of E flat major to G major, involve dual semitonal displacements in contrary motion;
3. *Polar* harmonies, such as E flat major and B minor, have no common tones and so simultaneously displace all three voices semitonally.¹⁸²

Such terms can be applied to transitions between hexatonic systems, as well as within them.

Cohn is particularly interested in the relationship between polar harmonies within an axis, discussing them in his article “Maximally Smooth Cycles”.¹⁸³ This focus is worth noting, as tonal poles are an important feature of Franck’s Quintet. Cohn describes the movement between two tonal poles as “uncanny”, and states that the juxtaposition of tonal poles has the ability to “annihilate

---

¹⁸¹ Cohn, "As Wonderful as Star Clusters: Instruments for Gazing at Tonality in Schubert,” 217.
¹⁸² Ibid., 215.
tonality”\textsuperscript{184}. This idea will be explored both later in this chapter and in relation to Franck’s Quintet. It is also worth noting that pitch-class sets are discussed later, though pitch-class set analysis itself will not be employed. Such analysis was developed to identify structural components within atonal works, and though Franck’s compositions are deeply chromatic, it is my belief that they still require an analysis based in a tonal framework. Rather than analysing from a pitch-class set framework, pitch-classes are a taken into consideration when analysing the factors that contribute to coherence in Franck’s works, and also how they might temporarily annihilate tonality. Background to this approach is covered by Allen Forte.\textsuperscript{185}

Cohn’s diagram showing the relationship of the four hexatonic systems – described as the “hyper-hexatonic system” – shows each system with what Downes would label the “subdominant axis” on its left, the “dominant” on its right, with the “supertonic” opposite. As he explains, they are arranged in this way to denote voice-leading efficiency. Within a hexatonic axis the number of semitone steps between triads ranges from 0 (enharmonic equivalents, such as F-sharp major and G-flat major) to 3 (hexatonic poles such as F-sharp major to D minor). The reader may also note that two augmented triads can be formed. For each neighbouring hexatonic system the steps range from 2 – 4, and for opposite hexatonic systems the number of steps ranges from 5 – 6. Cohn describes how “each hexatonic system is directly connected to the two neighbouring systems, but \ldots not directly connected to the system opposite.”\textsuperscript{186} Opposite systems are used in some works, such as Franck’s Psyché, but such works’ coherence may be more determined by shared wholetone scales or other forces rather than relationships of an axial nature. These are examples of

\textsuperscript{184} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{186} Cohn, "Maximally Smooth Cycles, Hexatonic Systems, and the Analysis of Late-Romantic Triadic Progressions," 23.
compositions which adhere to principles other than axial-hexatonic ones, despite their apparent use of axial-hexatonic systems.

**Figure 2.9: Cohn’s hyper-hexatonic system**

This diagram also effectively illustrates the pc sets inherent within the complementary augmented triads; this will be discussed more extensively in relation to pc set use in Franck’s Quintet later in the thesis.

In the article “Weitzmann’s Regions, My Cycles, and Douthett’s Dancing Cubes”\(^{188}\), Cohn draws a close relationship between a primary hexatonic system

\(^{187}\) Ibid., 24.
and its “subdominant” or “Eastern” system. The relationship is explored with regard to the augmented triad, say, C–E–G-sharp, and the triads that can be created by displacing one semitone of the triad. From this exercise the triads C major, A minor, E major, C-sharp minor, A-flat major and F minor can all be generated. In this article, Cohn has drawn on the work of Weitzmann (who predates Riemann) and his work on the augmented triad. Though Cohn explores the potential for this cycle more thoroughly (and in graphic form), what is important for our purposes is the close relationship between one hexatonic system and its “subdominant” neighbour, and we must consider the possible implications of such close key-relationships.

Another writer concerned with the functional equivalence of major-third related keys is David Kopp. Cited earlier in this chapter for his explanatory work on Riemann, Kopp’s own thoughts on function are demonstrated in a number of analyses. In contrast to Cohn, Kopp analyses the effect of mediant progressions over a larger scale (possibly comparable to the “middle-ground”). He concludes that mediant relations within a system/tonic axis may prolong the tonic. Though he does not examine the possibility of complementary systems, he does suggest that:

> given repeated hearing, third-circles can indeed convey a heard sense of directed departure from and return to the tonic. The distance covered is greater; the pace of change is more marked; the chromatic content challenges the ear. But the circle is short, direct connections are present between each element, and there is no reason to assume that the tonic must be reintroduced by its dominant to be heard as the tonic once again. In fact, after two identical chromatic third relations, the likely

---

189 Ibid.
continuation is one more of the same – which provides the return to the tonic. Also a memory of the tonic may well linger to confirm arrival.\textsuperscript{191}

Kopp is convinced that a tonal system is capable of supporting chromatic relationships alongside diatonic ones, and that functionality and scale degree can be separated. He states that: “the tonal system can support chromatic relationships along with diatonic ones without loss of the sense of tonic . . . harmonic relationships are holistic entities whose essence may surpass the sum of their parts.”\textsuperscript{192} This idea is significant, as the “functions” many writers are so concerned about can vary according to context. He finishes by saying “the language of common-tone relations and transformations represents first and foremost a way of thinking directly about chromatic harmony in music.”\textsuperscript{193} This new way of thinking, which concerns all the authors discussed in this chapter, requires descriptive tools that can recognise chromatic entities communicating diatonic function; tools that are descriptive rather than prescriptive; and tools that identify the relationships between major-third related keys.

Before moving onto chord-specific literature, it is apt to consider one final theorist: Robert C. Cook, a pupil of Cohn’s. Cook’s work is significant as his thesis uses Franck’s work to demonstrate his theories of transformative processes. It should be noted, though, that Cook’s ideas regarding interpretations of chromaticism and approaches to analysis differ significantly to my own. His view of the music is “from a transformational outlook, in which triads relate through networks of chromatic voice leading, rather than tonal hierarchies”,\textsuperscript{194} and he also states that “it is precisely the failure of traditional analytical methodologies to address their underlying prescriptive, regulatory,

\begin{flushleft}\textsuperscript{191} Ibid.  \\
\textsuperscript{192} Ibid., 235.  \\
\textsuperscript{193} Ibid.  \\
\textsuperscript{194} Robert Cameron Cook, ”Transformational Approaches to Romantic Harmony and the Late Works of César Franck” (PhD Diss., University of Chicago, 2001), xiv. \end{flushleft}
hierarchical conceptual foundations that renders their analyses of chromatic music unsatisfying”. 195 Though Cook’s work is more focused on transformational theory rather than our concerns of sonata form and its relation to harmony, his work reinforces one of the broader themes of this analysis: that is, that Franck is experimenting with the functions of chromatic harmony, with mixed success. In the article “Parsimony and Extravagance”, Cook takes interest in passages which feature tonal poles and the harmonic events that surround them: that is, “when a musical event or series of events encourages intuitions of coherence while at the same time this coherence resists ascription to the influence of a diatonic tonic.” 196 Parsimonious voice-leading is defined as “[voice-leading which retains] two common tones when moving between triads” 197 and extravagance defined as voice-leading where “each of the three triadic voices moves by semitone and only by semitone; no common tones are permitted.” 198 Such voice-leading effects are discussed later in the analysis of Franck’s Quintet.

In his thesis, Cook writes that the aspects of chromatic music that are important are the aural effect of particular progressions, motivic and thematic character, and participation in a contextually-defined syntax: not, he notes explicitly, “the extent to which they support a diatonic tonal center”. 199 I agree with Cook inasmuch that any analytical method(s) should be self-reflective. Yet, as a listener, I approach Franck from a diatonic framework because this is how I experience most of his music: the fact that he adheres to traditional notions of concentric tonality makes it common sense to do so, and Franck seems to see himself working within a diatonic convention. Yes, Franck’s music is chromatic,

195 Ibid.
196 Ibid., 110.
197 Ibid., 116.
198 Ibid.
199 Ibid., 5.
to be sure; but if I perceive any hierarchy of sonority in his music, should I not at least consider the prospect of a diatonic centre? Furthermore, is not the “aural effect of particular progressions” likely to reference some sort of musical hierarchy, whether it be part of a diatonic tonal framework or otherwise? I suggest that interpreting Franck’s work in a diatonic context that is able to accommodate Franck’s rich chromaticism is likely to be the best approach. However, Cook’s analyses of Franck do sometimes make astute observations, and some of these will be included in my own analyses. Interestingly, Cook only examines singular movements of the Quintet, Quartet and Symphony – not the whole works. In this sense it feels as though his analysis is focussed more closely on isolated movements, whilst I consider the relationship between individual movements and the whole work to be important.

It is now important to consider triads more closely, as the relationships between chords at a foreground level have implications for keys on a larger scale.

**Chord – triads (i)**

Let us return briefly to Riemann. If *Systematische Modulationslehre* emphasised the special properties of chromatic mediant relations, Riemann’s later treatises treated this idea more cautiously. In the *Katechismus der Musik*, Riemann began to examine function more specifically. Each chord and progression is addressed in relation to the tonic, and designated as possessing either as tonic, overdominant (V) or underdominant (IV) function. However, despite the prescriptive nature of explanation, Kopp does not consider this to be a “fully worked out” functional theory. *Vereinfachte Harmonielehre* (1893) is a more indicative treatise, as here Riemann retains the notion that there are three “pillars of harmony”, as discussed above, and describes each of these as
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200 Kopp, *Chromatic Transformations in Nineteenth-Century Music*, 86.
embodying a function. He describes how all diatonic chords other than the tonic, dominant and subdominant contain mixtures of notes which belong to one of these primary triads, and that the tonic, dominant and subdominant “constitute the three main tonal functions, or harmonic essences.” Each mixed triad has a “single functional identity”, which might be described as the “predominant functional identity”, and is usually that of the majority element. Relationships are described through transformational modifications of each primary chord: the adjectives Parallele, Variante and Leittonwechsel (leading-note change) describe the relationship between the primary chords and those with shared intervals. The parallel describes triads with common major thirds (such as C major/A minor); the variant describes those that share a perfect fifth (such as C major/C minor) and the leading-tone change describes those chords that share a minor third (such as C minor/A-flat major). Context does play a role however, as of course all major and minor triads are made up of both a major and minor third. Hence an E minor chord could be functionally identified as a tonic Leittonwechsel or a dominant parallel, depending on its context, as it shares two common notes with the tonic and two different common notes with the dominant. Similarly, the VI triad in major may be a tonic parallel or subdominant Leittonwechsel, depending on its context.

202 Ibid.
203 Ibid.
204 Harrison, Harmonic Function in Chromatic Music, 284.
Figure 2.10: The eight third relations from a major tonic as expressed in
Riemann: root-interval system (from Kopp\textsuperscript{205})

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mediant progression</th>
<th>Riemann term</th>
<th>Actual root relation</th>
<th>Riemann root relation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) USM e.g. $c^+e^+$</td>
<td>schlichte Terzschritt</td>
<td>M3 up; plain</td>
<td>M3 up; plain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) UFM e.g. $c^+-e^+$</td>
<td>Gegenkleinterschritt</td>
<td>m3 up; plain</td>
<td>m3 up; plain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) LSM e.g. $c^+a^+$</td>
<td>schlichte Kleeinterschritt</td>
<td>m3 down; plain</td>
<td>m3 down; plain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) LFM e.g. $c^+a^+$</td>
<td>Gegeninterschritt</td>
<td>M3 down; plain</td>
<td>M3 down; plain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) URM e.g. $c^+-e^+$</td>
<td>Leittonwechsel</td>
<td>M3 up; change</td>
<td>M3 up; change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) LRM e.g. $c^+-e^+$</td>
<td>Terzwechsel</td>
<td>m3 down; change</td>
<td>M2 down; change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) UDM e.g. $c^+-e^+$</td>
<td>Gegengonterwechsel</td>
<td>m3 up; change</td>
<td>M2 down; change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) LDM e.g. $c^+-e^+$</td>
<td>Gegengonterwechsel</td>
<td>M3 down; change</td>
<td>m3 up; change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As well as this discussion of functional equivalency, Riemann asks: whether a mediant might convincingly precede the tonic in a final cadence. If it can, then mediants may be considered functional substitutes for the dominant or subdominant (see footnote 68). In Kopp’s words “[Riemann] asserts that major-third mediants unquestionably can do so, and that minor-third mediants probably can.”\textsuperscript{206} If this evaluation holds true, it sets an important precedent for this thesis; yet, we must remember that despite the theoretical potential for a third-relative to precede the tonic in a final cadence, there are few (if any) musical examples to suggest the effect would be compositionally desirable. As Schoenberg accounts in his “directions for better progressions” chapter:

Looking for a substitute for V, we shall consider the suitability of III. This degree has two chord tones in common with I, and that is a shortcoming here. But it has the leading tone, thus excluding F major, and its root progression is relatively strong (third downwards). It ought then to be suitable, anyway. Yet, it is not commonly used; hence, we shall not use it much either, but shall remember why we do not: chiefly because it is not commonly used. That means, it could be used. Its effect would very likely be weaker; above all, though, it would be unfamiliar.\textsuperscript{207} 

\textsuperscript{205} Kopp, Chromatic Transformations in Nineteenth-Century Music, 72. 
\textsuperscript{206} Ibid., 92. 
This illustrates both the pervasiveness of harmonic convention and the importance of remembering that theories are well and good, but it is existing music that we are most interested in.\textsuperscript{208}

Despite the evidence thus far that Riemann gives for the functional significance of mediants at a foreground level – which seems limited to common tones and some suggestion of similar voice-leading possibilities – it is important to note that in his 1890 treatise \textit{Katechismus der Harmonielehre}, Riemann “moderated his advocacy” of chromatic mediants, as he had difficulty accounting for them within his theory of function:\textsuperscript{209}

The chromatic mediants more readily resolve to other chords than directly back to their tonics. These are idealised mediating chords which regularise the chromatic tones by preserving them or by continuation through passing motion. They are not meant to be taken as examples of the regular, properly notated behaviour of \textit{Terzschrifte} [minor third relatives] in music.\textsuperscript{210}

Yet Riemann’s earlier theories discuss the inherent potential for mediant chords to be functionally equivalent. Whether or not they must always behave this way is another question entirely; what is important at this vantage is that they invoked such curiosity in Riemann, and as such they deserve to be considered more closely. Even in the passage above, Riemann grants mediants a special

\textsuperscript{208} There are certainly instances in which juxtaposition of chords that share an axis may be desirable, but whether the effect is “cadential” is another question. Such an instance might include the awakening of Brünnhilde in the final scene of \textit{Siegfried}, which juxtaposes the chords of C and E (which also have associative significance). Patrick Phillip McCreless, “Wagner's Siegfried: Its Drama, History, and Music,” (Ann Arbor, Michigan: UMI Research Press, an imprint of University Microfilms International, 1982), 211. Furthermore, the last four bars of Liszt’s Symphonic Poem \textit{Les Préludes} utilise a I – iii – I cadence, but this is superseded by a final perfect cadence. This I – iii – I movement might be interpreted as a foreground manifestation of iii’s significance: yet despite this, I – iii – I remains insufficient to end the work conclusively.

\textsuperscript{209} Kopp, \textit{Chromatic Transformations in Nineteenth-Century Music}, 83.

\textsuperscript{210} Ibid.
quality. To answer the question posed at the beginning of this chapter, Riemann does seem – at one time or other – to have been intrigued by the potential for the functional equivalence of major thirds.

**Riemann’s critics and problems with his theory**

One aspect of Riemann’s analytical technique is that the meaning (function) and direction (trajectory) of a chord may be described, but not together; yet both these aspects are required to build a complete tonal picture. Later or Neo-Riemann theory – from the 1980s to the present day – is more concerned with structural coherence than trajectory, representing a “break from [the] teleological paradigm”\(^\text{211}\) represented by Schenkerian analysis. Neo-Riemann analyses such as those by Lewin and Cohn are usually concerned with presenting networks of harmonic relationships that are “directional but not determined.”\(^\text{212}\) Therefore neither an old nor new Riemann analysis – nor a teleological Schenkerian one – is capable of illustrating both the function *and* the trajectory of a given chord, primarily because music does not behave so prescriptively that one can determine how chords will behave one to the next; certainly not in music composed after 1800. As a functional and directional analysis is indeed desirable, complementary analytical tools will be necessary.

It is important, however, to consider the shortcomings of Riemann’s theories. Dahlhaus, for instance, has criticised Riemann for not clarifying whether the tonic dominant and subdominant are “terms for chordal scale degrees or for functions.”\(^\text{213}\) Harrison elucidates this problem, reminding us that “Riemann essentially equated function with primary triad. Tonic function equals tonic meaning equals tonic triad. But what now does meaning mean? And what other

\(^{211}\) Ibid., 137.
\(^{212}\) Ibid.
than itself could tonic possibly mean?” Harrison suggests that *functional energy* is found within scale degrees, as Cook describes: “the tonal meaning of triad relations is carried by the voice leading between individual scale degrees of complementary tonal charge (e.g. 7 – 1 or b6 – 5).” Brian Hyer also points out related issues with Riemann’s theories, in particular his conceptualisation of tonic: “Because of the gravitational distortion a tonic introduces into tonal space, and because [Riemann] thought of the dominant as a concrete triad rather than an abstract relation, Riemann was never able to appreciate the transformational (or chromatic) potential of his harmonic theories.”

The same applies for the other triads and functional categories Riemann discusses: “rather than regarding [parallel, relative and leittonwechsel] as names for relations between harmonies, he used them as names for the harmonies themselves.” Whilst Hyer acknowledges that “certain harmonic configurations do seem to insist on an intrinsic relation or affiliation with a referential tonic”, he finds the consideration of the dominant as a “being” rather than a “doing” problematic.

It is worth considering why certain harmonic applications were rarely used by composers, whilst other configurations were employed regularly. It seems reasonable to think that curiosity alone would have led to experimentation using different keys as tonicising roles. As mentioned previously, III is often used as a tonicising agent in minor keys, but the major key inverse, I – vi, is rarely used. This leads us to consider that perhaps vi could be considered
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219 Exceptions here perhaps include Brahms’ B major Piano Trio and the first movement of the *Hammerklavier*. 
more of a “being” than a “doing”, if compositional statistics hold true. This consideration may also be applied to the supertonic axis; aside from specific well-documented instances (which are often parodistic), the supertonic axis is rarely used as a tonicising agent or a “doing” in other words.\textsuperscript{220} Exceptions of this include the second movements of Beethoven’s Ninth Symphony and his Op. 70 Piano Trio. Both instances use the flat-seventh scale degree as an oppositional tonal centre (IIβ), the second instance a sonata without development.

\textbf{Coherence}

Harrison recognises that lack of coherence (or lack of a semblance of coherence) is problematic in the extremely chromatic music such as Reger’s that typifies the end of the nineteenth century. Analysis of such works became difficult, sometimes to the point of near impossibility. In an article discussing Reger’s “Atonal Expressionism”, specifically looking at his \textit{Fantasie uber “Wachet auf! Ruft uns die Stimme”}, Harrison states that:

The chord string for each repetition is slightly different each time, however, and the tonal relations of each chord are, at best, neighbourly on voice-leading grounds, but not at all representative of a governing tonal center. They are what Ernst Kurth called “Absolute Progressions,” with each chord seemingly self-sufficient and tonally referential only to itself.\textsuperscript{221}

In “Harmonic Function in Chromatic Music”, however, Harrison states that “the umbilical relationship between certain chords and harmonic tonality was, by the late nineteenth century, discovered to be withered and unnecessary.”\textsuperscript{222}

\textsuperscript{220} Exceptions which use the supertonic axis include the Scherzo of the Ninth Symphony and the Ghost trio, both of which use \textsuperscript{b}VII.


\textsuperscript{222} Harrison, \textit{Harmonic Function in Chromatic Music}, 11.
Though this statement is arguably more applicable to Schoenberg than earlier composers, if it does hold true and composers were still concerned with tonicity as a means of coherence, then the palate that nineteenth century composers enjoyed must be considered functional as well as non-functional. Whether every composer managed to differentiate between the two is another question, and Reger’s meagre reception history suggests not – it is important to remember that the nineteenth century was a time of great experimentation, not all of which is worthy of canonisation. Though Reger quipped that “any chord can follow another chord”, music that is composed on this basis and still wishes to retain any functional principles is unlikely to enjoy a celebrated reception history.223 “Riemann’s harmonic theory acknowledged this fact through its idea of harmonic function, which asserts that other structures besides, for example, the tonic triad are capable of communicating ‘tonicness’.”224 What these “other structures” are is vital to answer our opening questions: whether there is evidence to suggest that major-third relatives can be functionally equivalent and the extent to which such relatives be incorporated into a framework that is still largely governed by diatonic principles.225

Harrison’s analytical method is similar to Riemann’s in that it consists of dissolving chords into their scale-degree components. Within triads, SD 1s are described as “bases”, SD 3s as “agents”, and 5s as “associates.”226 Yet Harrison shows how these labels need to be considered in their harmonic context: using a tonic 6/4 chord as an example, the base of dominant function overrides the root/base tonic function, and hence gives a dominant “discharge”. In this,

223 Ibid., 1.
224 Ibid., 11.
225 Downes argues that this is the case in Mahler’s music, but whether the same is applicable to Reger, or even Franck, is arguable.
226 Harrison, Harmonic Function in Chromatic Music, 47.
Harrison emphasises the importance of inversions and scoring in analysis.\textsuperscript{227} (We must remember that harmonic ambiguity may be a quality desirable to a composer, and it is quite possible for, say, a 6/4 chord to have both tonic and dominant function.) Harrison concurs with Riemann’s delegation of I, IV and V being primary triads, functioning in the ways we are familiar with, and also examines secondary triads, explaining that they are functionally mixed structures that are able to “communicate more than one function.”\textsuperscript{228} For example, E minor may be $v/v/v/V$ in the context of C (i.e. it may participate in the cycle of fifths) but when it functions as iii the effect – its expressive aura – is very different. Kurth discusses this with the idea of the “absolute progression” and “absolute effect,” arguing that a chord’s effect depends on its relationship to the chord before it. It can be argued that I-iii-vi-ii-V-I is expressively a different order to I-iii-I: minor chords may reveal their potential morbidity when cut free of cycle of fifths function. Kurth states that:

This last phenomenon, the luminous effect of an individual progression, the appeal resulting from the collision of two chords, is concealed in simple tonal music, [is] more suppressed and inconspicuous in the overall effect of the harmonic context, being more absorbed in the tonal structure of the total complex. . . . in other words . . . the relation of a harmony to the tonic is more significant than the relationship in the progression of two successive chords individually.\textsuperscript{229}

However, as well as a chord’s relationship to a referential tonic and its relationship to the harmony immediately preceding it, there is the consideration of a chord’s “sonic appeal . . . by its absolute effect.”\textsuperscript{230} In straightforward tonal music this absolute effect is masked by relative

\textsuperscript{227} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{228} Ibid., 60.
\textsuperscript{229} Lee A. Rothfarb, \textit{Ernst Kurth: Selected Writings}, Cambridge: Studies in Music Theory and Analysis (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 119. It is also arguable that such movement will also affect the chord appearing after it, depending, of course, on context.
\textsuperscript{230} Ibid.
relationships, but it is possible – and indeed more prevalent in chromatic music – for the more local effects to be stressed.\textsuperscript{231}

When a harmonic style reaches the point of highlighting the effect inherent in the unmediated collision of two chords as a specific effect in itself, we then have a phenomenon that, in its content and significance, lies on the same evolutionary path as the third evolutionary stage, the highlighting of an individual chordal, sonic quality as such . . . [it becomes a] preliminary step in the escalation toward the absolute individual effect.\textsuperscript{232}

As for when to label an effect as “absolute”, Kurth suggests there is an “absolute progression effect” when such a progression is “thrust outward – i.e., in relief against the surrounding context.” He suggests this is (at least in part) due to the Romantic period’s “delight in the sonic appeal itself.”\textsuperscript{233}

Returning to Harrison, in regard to mediants, he writes that their function depends largely on their inversion and structure: if SD 3 is the root-base its function is “strongly tonic”, whilst SD 5 and 7 (agent-associate) are “strongly dominant.”\textsuperscript{234} In a similar fashion, Harrison describes how the diminished seventh can convey both dominant and subdominant functions, depending on which tones are prominent and how the inversion is manipulated.\textsuperscript{235}

\textsuperscript{231} Ibid., 120.
\textsuperscript{232} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{233} Ibid., 121.
\textsuperscript{234} Harrison, \textit{Harmonic Function in Chromatic Music}, 66.
\textsuperscript{235} Ibid.
We might also note that such chords can be used as rootless German sixths or dominant minor ninths. In practical application, it is most likely that the dominant agent and associate will aurally outweigh the subdominant base and agent, but the subdominant function is present nonetheless.

Many of Harrison’s ideas are useful to the methods used here, particularly the importance he grants to individual scale degrees and the roles they play in the determining of harmonic movement and perception of tonicity. His ideas about mediants reinforce those of Riemann, who wrote about their ability to convey a sense of tonicity despite being secondary triads. However, one concern with Harrison’s theory lies with his concentration on harmony, which he justifies by describing how the New German School did not find parallel fifths problematic.
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because their primary concern was harmony, not voice-leading. Yet it is precisely voice-leading properties that encourage us to hear tonicity – within cadences and elsewhere – and hence they must remain a vital consideration, along with harmony, for this form of analysis. Salzer reinforces this concept:

In separating harmony from counterpoint, we shall find that harmonic progressions contain a contrapuntal feature, the simultaneous motion of several voices. The converse does not hold true, however, because contrapuntal progressions can be studied in pure form without any interference from harmonic considerations. This appears quite logical if we realize that harmonic progressions came to be used only after great contrapuntal experience had been acquired during the course of several centuries.238

Additionally, the various interpretations of secondary triads depend on voice-leading properties to make their “meaning” known. Because of this, both harmony and voice-leading will be considered in this thesis. With this in mind, we must also consider chords larger than triads – those with added sixths and sevenths – in isolation.

**Chords – Added Sixths and Sevenths (ii)**

Harrison is also concerned with the role of the augmented sixth chord. He describes how the chord resolves in the same way as the diminished fifth or seventh, concluding that all three chords share “at least some” inherent “tonal propulsion.”239 As we know, diminished fifths and sevenths occur naturally between scale degrees, playing “position finding” roles (that help define a sense of tonicity) therein. Schenker describes these intervals as “univalent.”240
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Conversely, augmented sixths do not appear naturally between scale degrees, and this compels Harrison to describe them as “nonvalent.” 242 This definition suggests the augmented sixth’s potential for position-finding function is very different. Harrison argues for any chord possessing an augmented sixth interval to be considered as such (not just the ethnic varieties) and also prescribes predominant (dominant preparation), dominant and subdominant qualities on all these augmented sixths, depending on which scale degrees are involved and how they are used. The potential for the augmented sixth to act as a dominant is of particular interest as augmented sixths are often present in Franck’s music, and the implications of these will be explored further in the following chapters. The idea of an augmented sixth chord substituting for the dominant is also present in Schoenberg, who gives such a progression as an example in *Theory of Harmony*. However, Schoenberg seems to consider the progression coherent because it is an “abbreviation” of a cadential “cliché”, rather than because augmented sixths contain special voice-leading properties – similar to the abbreviation of II or ii resolving directly to I without the intervening V. 243 Nevertheless, his assertion that “such abbreviations can in general be undertaken only with progressions that have a definite function, hence, primarily in cadences” ties in with Harrison’s ideas. 244
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Adrian Child’s work on seventh chords is also useful for this discussion.245 Childs notes that “while the analytical insights [of Neo-Riemann analysis] have proved rich and stimulating, a fundamental problem has also arisen: the composers whose works seem best suited for Neo-Riemann analysis rarely limited their harmonic vocabulary to simple triads.”246 Indeed, no analyst in this chapter has yet discussed the voice-leading nature(s) of seventh chords. Childs suggests that a new model (to add to Neo-Riemann analysis) is needed, one that incorporates seventh chords, particularly dominant and half-diminished sevenths. He then examines extracts by Wagner and Chopin. Both passages use chains of seventh chords, and Childs demonstrates how sevenths contribute to the efficacy of the voice-leading. A straightforward Neo-Riemann analysis would most likely focus only on the triads, but Childs argues for a new model which incorporates sevenths into analysis.247 His model has potential for describing different types of seventh chord transformations, but he uses only a few, short examples to illustrate the potential for analytical insight. Nevertheless, Childs reminds us that when discussing music of this type, sevenths must be awarded the special consideration they deserve, particularly in passages which are resistant to purely triadic analysis or which involve chains of sevenths. However, it is worth noting that the roles of seventh and seventh-less dominant could not be effectively reversed in their respective contexts. According to Downes’ axial theory, the addition of a seventh to a perfect cadence “combines a subdominant function to the prevailing dominant functions already present.”248 This is not to say that V7 – I is a weaker progression than V – I: rather that the effect is a different one.

246 Ibid., 181.
247 Ibid., 182.
Matthew Bribitzer-Stull also contributes to these ideas with an article on what he calls “The A-flat-C-E Complex.” Bribitzer-Stull is primarily concerned with the effect an augmented triad can have on the background structure of a work. He suggests that although two keys within the A-flat-C-E axis can be incorporated into a diatonic framework and read as mixture, when all three are present and are not “anchored by a diatonic Stufe” it is possible for the background structure to be disturbed. It is less the chord itself and more what it leads to that determines a chord’s role in this context. He also notes that disrupting the diatonic Stufe is a significant step towards atonality because of its symmetry, and uses Liszt’s “Nuages gris” as an example.

Some Methodological Issues

At this point it is worth examining what an axial-hexatonic system is able to accomplish. Many writers examined here seem to agree on the ability of axial-hexatonic systems to convey functional equivalence, or at least “tonal neutrality”: the ability for music to modulate without sounding as if it has disturbed tonal function. But what are the differences between these writers, and what parameters are appropriate for this study?

252 Charles Rosen, *The Classical Style* (London: Faber and Faber Ltd., 2005), 272. Rosen notes that in Beethoven’s ninth Symphony, “Beethoven replays the main theme on B-flat major, the submediant (which he will again use as a dominant), but in such a way that it still sounds as if the tonality had not left the tonic D minor.” [My emphasis.]
Downes, Cohn and other writers state or imply tonal neutrality as the basic function of axial relatives, though some writers are more overt in this than others. In analyzing Schubert’s piano sonatas, for example, Downes states that:

For Schubert, the tonal interval of the major third clearly had the capacity for what could almost be called passive modulation (my emphasis.) This property was exploited to increase the breadth and scale of some of his later sonata form works, without jeopardizing the set functions of the various structural sections.  

Similarly, Bribitzer-Stull notes that in [the A-flat-C-E complex], chromatic thirds could be “strung” from and to the tonic. This happens in Chopin’s Polonaise, Op. 53, in which the tonic A-flat is prolonged (my emphasis) first by its upper third, C, and later by its lower third, E. Kopp notes similar prolongations in the works he examines, including Schubert’s fourth Symphony and Chausson’s Piano Trio No. II.

For Cohn, in contrast, hexatonic modulation is perhaps more ethereally suggestive than functionally prolongational. Regarding the effect of modulation within a hexatonic system, Cohn suggests that motion between hexatonic poles is “frequently affiliated, by both composers and listeners, with an ethos of uncanniness.” Examples from Wagner’s Parsifal and Mahler’s second Symphony are used for illustration; both extracts concerned with the spiritual – in the first, the removal of Kundry’s soul from her body, and the second dealing with “resurrection”. Cohn considers the juxtaposition of hexatonic poles as especially significant, as the juxtaposition “resists interpretation in terms of

255 Kopp, Chromatic Transformations in Nineteenth-Century Music, 225.
diatonic tonality.”\textsuperscript{257} This may be true, but despite the triads III and $b\text{VI}$ not being diatonic, they are often incorporated into largely diatonic compositions all the same, suggesting they are desirable tonal areas for other reasons. Perhaps one of these reasons is the parsimonious voice-leading they enable, or functional equivalence. Earlier, I mentioned Cohn’s concern with the ability of tonal poles to “annihilate tonality”. Though this might be temporarily true in a piece of music, usually it will only be for a specific case within a wider axial structure, as hierarchy can also be established rhythmically using phrase structure.\textsuperscript{258}

\textbf{Figure 2.13: Pitch-class set [4, 5, 8, 9, 12, 13]}

Nonetheless, we can illustrate this relationship by creating a pitch-class set using the tones of D-flat and A minor: G-sharp – A – C – C-sharp – E – F.\textsuperscript{259} Using these notes we can create pairs of triads that have two common tones, one common tone, or no common tones, constituting three levels of triadic potential. This construction is reinforced by the wholetone nature of the fundamental bass between two major third related chords within a pitch class set: there is no way of telling whether chords have two, one or no notes in common in the absence of a non wholetone bass, or which has a dominant or subdominant function one relative to the other. I surmise, then, that polar relationships represent the non-plus-ultra of ambivalence within the larger framework of tripartite axial ambivalence, but do not annihilate tonality outright. However, they come close to doing so, because such a pc set almost amounts to a triple \textit{Schreckensfanfare} – the tonality-

\textsuperscript{257} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{258} If phrasing and rhythm lack regularity, it may well be possible that tonal poles can annihilate tonality. However, in the works that both I and Cohn examine, this is rarely (if ever) the case.
\textsuperscript{259} This pc set is used because it is the same one Franck uses in his Quintet, analysed in Chapter Six.
obscuring opening to the finale of Beethoven’s Ninth Symphony. The \textit{Schreckensfanfare} has the tones \text{A}–\text{B-flat}–\text{D}–\text{F}, which constitute both a major-seventh chord and a double tonic complex of \text{B-flat}/D minor (the opposing keys of the Ninth Symphony). The pc set here can comprise three \textit{Schreckenschords} – A–C–E–F, C-sharp–E–G–sharp–A and F–A-flat–C–D–flat – and the ability to befuddle tonality is certainly present.

However, the fourth level of triadic potential – further than those chords which have no common tones – is represented by two augmented triads (here, G-sharp–C–E and A–C-sharp–F). Cohn does not discuss this potential in relation to pc sets and polar relationships. We know that these triads can – on a localised scale – annihilate tonality. Take, for example, the locus classicus of augmented triads: the opening of Liszt’s \textit{Faust} Symphony. This opening famously comprises four augmented triads comprising two hexatonic pc sets. Each acts as a subdominant of the chord which follows as the notes fall by semitone. Tonality is indeed annihilated in this instance: we have no way of interpreting the chords as anything but subordinate to the voice-leading processes of chords which precede them.

As well as differing in descriptions of their systems, Downes and Cohn also differ in terms of the musical works they choose to illustrate their ideas. Downes considers Beethoven and Schubert the most important instigators of the axial system, discussing Beethoven in detail and considering works of Liszt and Brahms before finally examining Mahler, the focus of his thesis. Cohn, however, is primarily concerned with the work of Schubert and later romantic composers such as Liszt, Franck, Wagner and Mahler. Though the analysis behind Cohn’s work is impressively detailed and at times extremely complex in regard to illustrating voice-leading relationships, he seems to be relatively unconcerned with precedents to a third-related key system. When Cohn
mentions precedents to romantic examples of hexatonic progressions in Mozart, Beethoven and even Bach, he states that in these examples “the triads in the hexatonic system are lightly tonicised using the standard resources of diatonic tonality.” He then concludes:

A related way to constrain the domain of hexatonic analysis would be to acknowledge that hexatonic elements might infiltrate compositions that otherwise operate according to the principles of diatonic tonality, but to limit the application to elements of these compositions that fail the standard test of diatonic coherence.

Though Cohn admits this approach may be limited as hexatonic and diatonic analyses should not be mutually exclusive, given that he restricts his analysis to examples from Schubert onward we might reasonably assume he considers works prior to Schubert “diatonically coherent.” This brings up an important point – what exactly is diatonic coherence, or lack thereof? Could it be considered the need to explain a key area or progression according to chromatic principles, regardless of whether the chromatic principles are in the fore or middle ground of a given work? With this definition I would describe Beethoven’s *Hammerklavier* Op. 106 as “lacking diatonic coherence” – how are we to explain the third movement’s key of F-sharp minor, when the tonic of the Sonata is B-flat? These keys are on completely opposite sides of the circle of fifths, our traditional roadmap of diatonic key relations.

Perhaps works prior to Schubert require a new evaluation of their diatonic coherence based on axial-hexatonic relationships, and perhaps Cohn has not fully considered the significance of hexatonic progressions in Beethoven’s work, which – particularly in the case of the *Hammerklavier* – become more

---


261 Ibid.
logical when analysed in an axial context. Furthermore, Cohn seems to regard the main effect of hexatonic progressions to be an evocation of the “uncanny” or an allusion to undertones of magic, and does not expound the idea that such progressions may play a crucial role in expanding and developing sections to unprecedented lengths whilst maintaining tonal neutrality.\textsuperscript{262} To put it an alternate way, Schubert’s tonal practices (and he is but one example) seem to indicate the functional as much as the expressive potential of axial systems, as well as the use of axial systems to evoke “heavenly length”\textsuperscript{263}, otherwise known as monumentality.

\textbf{Theoretical integration and Methodology}

Both Downes and Cohn, our predominant analysts, have much to offer an examination of Franck’s work. Axial analysis is predominantly focused on background relationships and how they are integrated into other facets of composition, from macro to micro events. As such, key tables will be included in my analyses to demonstrate works’ broad harmonic outlines and how they adhere to axial relationships (as they often do). However, Cohn’s discussions of pitch-class sets also have much to offer. Cohn’s perspective reminds us that we experience music in a temporal sense, and that as such foreground events are crucial to our experience and understanding of all music. As an analyst, one wishes to represent what is actually heard or experienced, not construct a discussion which bears little relation to the music itself. In Franck’s Quintet (discussed fully in Chapter Six) the tonal poles (which Cohn discusses) form a pc set which is integral to understanding the unity in the movement overall. Cohn’s suggestion that the tonal poles “annihilate tonality” forms a springboard from which tonal hierarchies – amalgamated with axial theory – are discussed. Hence,

\textsuperscript{262} Downes, ”An Axial System of Tonality Applied to Progressive Tonality in the Works of Gustav Mahler and Nineteenth Century Antecedents”, 18.

Cohn’s (and other theorists’) ideas will be used for discussion in the body of the text following the axial key tables. Through this, I aim to demonstrate how these complementary theories can work together. Before the analysis of Franck’s works can begin, however, it is apt to consider the influence Beethovenian models may have had on Franck’s compositional processes.
Chapter Three

The *Eroica* Symphony and the Problem of the Finale

This chapter examines Beethoven’s *Eroica* Symphony and the Problem of the Finale. Before I discuss this, however, a disclaimer and justification is appropriate, to explain why Beethoven is considered such an influential figure in this study. His prominence needs to be justified both in terms of his influence on Franck and use of axial-type procedures generally. Firstly, there is evidence that Franck was familiar with at least some (if not all) of the Beethoven works examined here; those we can be certain of include the String Quartet Op. 127 and the Ninth Symphony. It is also likely that Franck was familiar with most (if not all) the late-Beethoven String Quartets, as they regularly featured on the *Société Nationale*’s concert programs. 264 Furthermore, Franck’s comments on the composition of String Quartets imply a preoccupation with the significance of the genre (and hence what had gone before). Franck was convinced: “(and several of his students garnered his opinion on this point) that to risk writing a string quartet was a perilous enterprise that one could attempt only later in life.” 265

It is also important to note that axial-type procedures did not necessarily begin with Beethoven. There are instances of Haydn and Dussek (and others) using third-related keys as secondary key areas in sonata form works, including (but not restricted to) Haydn’s String Quartet Op. 20/4 and Dussek’s Piano Sonata No. 26 Op. 70. Stewart-MacDonald suggests such major-third digressions, particularly those to the “flat side” (frequently I♭) strengthen a tonic return when

---

264 Michael Strasser, ”Art as Teaching: Vincent d’Indy and Programming at the Société Nationale after 1886 ” in *Vincent d’Indy et Son Temps* (Sprimont: Mardaga, 2006), 140.
it occurs, as flat-side exploitations evoke a “strategic withdrawal of energy”\textsuperscript{266}. It seems certain that these composers pre-dating Beethoven were aware of the potential inherent in axial-type modulation. I argue, however, that whilst these earlier composers did use axial tonality in this way, their composition outcomes are not comparable to Beethoven, who not only used axial tonality but fully realised its potential as a manipulative agent of tonal drama. So, while these earlier classical composers had begun to use such sonorities, the potential of this type of tonal system was not fully realised until later. The present chapter and the next discuss some of Beethoven’s late period works more fully, illustrating the importance of such works in their respective genres. Franck’s knowledge of these seminal Beethoven works makes an examination of Beethoven’s oeuvre not only desirable, but mandatory.

Beethoven’s late period was one of experimentation, where he often departed from the conventional four-movement model usually used for symphonic and chamber works. This is not to say that his earlier works were not also formally innovative, but in his last period the preoccupation with form became more acute; he seems to have sought more varied and radical solutions to the finale problem. End-weighted works such as the Ninth Symphony and the String Quartet Op. 133 with its Große Fuge suggest by their size and demeanour that Beethoven was more conscious than ever of the problem of the finale. The works examined in this chapter see Beethoven adopting axial tonal schemes to effect more radical solutions to the problem of how to distribute weight across a multi-movement work, and through examining them we can discern several trends which could potentially influence those composers who followed him.

\textsuperscript{266} Rohan H. Stewart-MacDonald, \textit{New Perspectives on the Keyboard Sonatas of Muzio Clementi} (Bologna, Italy: Ut Orpheus Edizioni, 2006), 83.
One of the main concerns of this last period was the distribution of weight – emotional or durational in some works, but particularly tonal weight. Hence we often encounter Beethoven reserving the structural dominant until late in a multi-movement work. How and when Beethoven does this requires terminology that accurately describes the aural experience and compositional idea. This thesis posits the terms “immanent dominant” and “transcendent dominant.”

“Immanent” is used here to describe the strongest positioning of dominant within a single movement, such as the structural dominant in the first movement of the *Eroica*. The first movement affirms the tonic clearly, and the following movements are proportional in relation to each other by the standards of the classical period, despite the *Eroica’s* enlarged proportions. “Transcendent dominant” refers to an overarching dominant of the entire work, such as works in which the central movements posit a structural dominant (“transcendent”) of the work overall. Often works in which the immanent dominant is withheld feature moments in which the dominant is briefly touched on, such as at significant structural points. I highlight instances of this in the following analysis, in this and later chapters. “Transcendent” may seem problematic as a term, but taking the verb “transcend” we can understand its meaning as “be or go beyond the limits of (something abstract, typically a field or division).” By contrast “immanent” is defined as “existing or operating within; inherent.” In the examples we will examine, we will see that Beethoven and others alter the weighting of multi-movement works by altering the placement and shaping of dominants both within single movements and works as a whole. As such, we can

---

267 I am aware of the use of these terms in a theological sense, but I consider these terms the best fit for the meaning I am trying to convey. Hence the above discussion might be considered a reshaping for a musicological audience, as the terms convey the sense of significance within the concepts discussed.

268 Such as Beethoven’s *Hammerklavier* Sonata Op. 106 or the Ninth Symphony.


consider “immanent” and “transcendent” to be appropriate terms for describing how the dominant operates within any given work.

The Eroica Model

With these terms in mind, we begin by examining the Eroica model. Despite its inherent problems, the Classical trope of the regular sonata form movement as expanded by Beethoven significantly influenced some composers, particularly those writing shortly after his death. Here we are able to distinguish between those who followed immediately after Beethoven, and the “second age of the symphony”.\footnote{Carl Dahlhaus, \textit{Nineteenth Century Music} (Berkley: University of California, 1989), 265.} Dahlhaus discusses this at length, and notes that in \textit{Oper und Drama} Wagner declared the death of the symphony, “viewing the post-Beethovenian efforts as a mere epilogue with nothing substantially new to say.”\footnote{Ibid.} Yet, French Nationalism also plays a part here: the establishment of the \textit{Societe Nationale} in 1871, with its slogan \textit{ars gallica}:

sought refuge amidst the French catastrophe [and] was almost insolubly ambiguous. In order to found a national symphonic and chamber music culture in opposition to their exclusive orientation in opera, French composers had to appropriate and recast a specifically German tradition – namely, Viennese classicism, a tradition upheld in Paris by Saint-Saëns himself.\footnote{Ibid., 263.}

It is unlikely to have escaped these composers – Franck among them – that if they were to say anything new, they must draw inspiration from the late Beethoven works, rather than the middle period ones which were largely responsible for the “mere epilogue” Wagner refers to. As the works examined in this thesis are almost exclusively composed post-1870, we are dealing with the “second age of the symphony”, and with that, the influence that such a second age could have on other genres. Because of this, we must examine what occurred in the period
between Beethoven’s death and the revival of the Symphony in the 1870s; hence the examination of the Eroica model.

Beethoven must have realised – or so it would seem from his late-period experimentation with form – the problem that arose from his otherwise successful expansion of classical form, and he attempted to create alternatives in the models we explore later in this chapter. Whilst it is understandable that some composers took the great middle-period works as exemplars (such as Schubert, a representation of whose work is examined shortly), many realised the problems this would create and were influenced instead by the formal innovations of Beethoven’s later works. Others attempted to turn away from Beethoven altogether.

It is relevant to examine the Eroica itself together with a work which uses that model: a regular sonata form movement by Schubert that possesses the Eroica’s famously expanded proportions. The results of this analysis may be useful to compare with those which follow different models, and will be examined in later chapters.

At this point it is important to note the usefulness of analysing works in relation to “models”. I suggest that, for each of the works discussed as examples of a model, the model is not a blueprint or monumental work that lends itself to apologetic parodying. Rather, these chapters and their models are grouped according to the guiding idea that gives the overall impression of the work, particularly in regard to immanent and transcendent dominants. Schubert’s Ninth Symphony, for example, is not a misunderstood Eroica Symphony, but rather shares important structural and formal characteristics with the Eroica model. In line with this, each sub-chapter will include a summary of the defining features of each model, followed by analysis and discussion.
Beethoven’s Eroica

It is worth examining the Eroica Symphony to ascertain just what features are significant to our model, though the main features will already be known to us. Although the Eroica was a landmark work in its time, it still fulfils Classical expectations in terms of Sonata form, though expanded in all parameters (and not only the first movement, but those that follow). The first movement is 846 bars long if the expository repeat is observed; which, it seems, was Beethoven’s final intention, and justifiable in that the numerous ideas require re-hearing for comprehension.\textsuperscript{274} That the first movement is a thoroughly satisfying statement in itself is almost inarguable, but just how did Beethoven achieve such a statement? A. Peter Brown writes:

In this first movement, Beethoven mustered all the resources at his disposal to present a large and thoroughly coherent statement. Carefully weighed articulations lend coherence to a number of discrete thematic ideas, continuations are built from developmental expansions, and rhythmic and harmonic dissonances are appropriately resolved. Even the opening hammerstrokes are recalled within the exposition, development, and recapitulation, and at the conclusion; this cliché, like every other gesture in this Allegro con brio, becomes part of an organically convincing essay.\textsuperscript{275}

An oft-cited example of resolution is the C-sharp in the seventh bar of the theme, which clouds the tonality from the beginning and demands resolution. This is eventually achieved in the recapitulation, where C-sharp gains new meaning when enharmonically reinterpreted as a D-flat.\textsuperscript{276} Beethoven exploits the “pun” of the German sixth and dominant seventh, as in the recapitulation the D-flat resolves downward to C, as opposed to up to D as occurs in bar seven. This is a wonderful resolution of Beethoven’s earlier audacity.


\textsuperscript{275} Ibid., 468.

\textsuperscript{276} Charles Rosen, The Classical Style (London: Faber and Faber Ltd., 2005), 393.
Any discussion of this movement cannot be complete without touching on just how much the “heroic” aspect captured the imagination of contemporary listeners and continues to capture our imagination today. Scott Burnham’s *Beethoven Hero* discusses this at length. He writes: “Beethoven’s first movement is . . . expressive of an almost universally accessible psychological process: a dangerous yet necessary exploration of some unconscious aspect of the psyche is followed by a tremendous sense of reintegration and affirmation.”277 Yet listening to Beethoven’s late works sometimes gives us another sense entirely – of something dangerous but necessary being wilfully avoided, which we might also describe as dramatisation of *inaction* (or blockage) in the late works as opposed to the dramatisation of *action* in movements like the first movement of the *Eroica*.

Given that one of the focuses of this thesis is the distribution of symphonic weight, the movements following the first of the *Eroica* must be examined: what can possibly seem fulfilling after such an affirming psychological process as the first movement? Perhaps because the projecting of programmes onto the first movement has been so popular, the “Marcia funebre” has been considered “a logical sequence to the ‘heroic’ character of the Allegro con brio.”278 This is also a large movement, a rondo in C minor. What the first movement emphasised in rhythmic displacement, the second emphasises in metric regularity; a complete rhythmic contrast.

Some of the keys used in the development of the first movement are expounded in the first part of the second – C, E-flat and F, whilst G minor is also used later.279 The second episode begins with a double fugue which increases the tension.

---

279 Ibid.
significantly whilst simultaneously retaining tonal flatness (which is partially why fugue as a form is so useful; see the discussion of fugue in the analysis of Op. 131 later in this chapter).\textsuperscript{280} A. Peter Brown writes:

The tonal plan interlocks the funeral march with the first movement, where the key of C became a well-articulated tertiary area. In the funeral march, E-flat major occurs twice (mm. 17, 181) and once in the second episode (m. 135) in a tonally solid context. This cyclic coherence is not the last of its sort to be found in the symphonies of Beethoven (e.g., Nos. 5 and 7), but it certainly is a convincing occurrence.\textsuperscript{281}

As with all music, the contrast between unity and diversity is an ongoing balancing act, but this coherence suggests Beethoven’s preoccupation with overarching tonal unity was in place relatively early.

The Scherzo, back in the tonic E-flat, is initially metrically and tonally ambiguous. Yet whilst the first, second and final movements of the \textit{Eroica} are considerably expanded compared to both Classical norms and to Beethoven’s earlier symphonic counterparts, the Scherzo is only slightly longer. What this movement lacks in length, however, it makes up for in energy. Rhythmically, this movement reactivates the 2/4 3/4 opposition that permeates the first movement so strongly.

\textbf{Figure 3.1: Beethoven Symphony No. 3/iii (Op. 55), bars 1 – 7}

\begin{figure}[h]
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\caption{Beethoven Symphony No. 3/iii (Op. 55), bars 1 – 7}
\end{figure}

\textsuperscript{280} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{281} Ibid.
Beethoven groups the crotchets in pairs at the opening and only reveals his triple time at bar five. The Alla breve at bar 381 (the downward arpeggiating minims, previously minim-crotchet) is the logical reason why Beethoven composes out the Scherzo as opposed to employing a Da Capo repeat; it “corrects” the rhythmic argument that begins the movement. The short length of the Scherzo also contrasts with the longer finale, which is more summative.

The finale is of particular significance for those of us who are concerned with symphonic balance. Here, Beethoven combines variation form with the Sonata Principle; the effect is a “musical struggle between melody and bass”; an introduction, strophic variations and coda bookend developmental variations. In this though, it seems a mere echo of sonata, in that expository and recapitulatory events are bookending developmental ones but eschewing the tonal opposition of sonata. As Rosen writes:

a finale demanded a simpler and less complex form than an opening movement: that is why it is generally a rondo, or a set of variations. . . . If it is a ‘sonata,’ then it is necessarily a squarer and simpler version of that form; . . . but, in any case, the thematic material of a finale is always rhythmically squarer than that of the first movement, the cadences heavily emphasised, the phrases well-defined, and the first theme completely rounded off before any harmonic movement can take place.²⁸³

The *Eroica* finale certainly fits this description; it also embodies a grounding of tension of the work overall. The following table outlines the structure more fully and illustrates the keys used in each section.

---
²⁸² Ibid., 475.
**Figure 3.2: Beethoven, Symphony No. 3/iv (Op. 55). Adapted from A. Peter Brown**

### Symphony No. 3, Fourth Movement, Opus 55

**Introduction:**

G minor to E-flat

**Part One: Exposition (Strophic)**

- **Bass (m.12)**
- **Var. 1 (m.44)**
- **Var. 2 (m.62)**
- **Var. 3 (m.78) = Bass + Theme**

**Transition to C minor (m.115)**

[iivα]

**Part Two: Development (Non-Strophic)**

- **Var. 4 (m.117): Fugato on Bass, C minor**
- **Var. 5 (m.175): Recapitulation of Theme and Var., D major**
- **Var. 6 (m.211): March, Ostinato on Bass, G minor**
- **Var. 7 (m.258): Recapitulation of Theme and Var., C major**
- **Var. 8 (m.276): Fugato in inversion of Bass and Theme, E-flat major**

**Part Three: Recapitulation (Strophic)**

**Poco Andante**

- **Var. 9 (m.349): Theme only/Bass gone**
- **Var. 10 (m.381): Theme in Bass**

**Closing (m.398): Modulatory**

**Coda**

---

284 Brown, *The Symphonic Repertoire: The First Golden Age of the Viennese Symphony: Haydn, Mozart, Beethoven and Schubert*, 461. ‘To’ is used where there were originally arrows.
My notes in square brackets interpret the keys of the *Eroica* finale in an axial context, showing a prevalence of subdominant axis members. This often occurs in second movements following a weighty sonata form first movement, but here occurs in the finale: why this may be is examined later.

Note in particular variation seven: its harmonic progression is uncannily similar to that of the first movement coda. In both cases the key “behaves itself” by progressing through the cycle of fifths to E-flat. A similar allusion can be drawn between the opening of the first movement’s development and the finale’s fourth variation: C minor proceeds through D minor and G minor, before the dissonant climax (F major7 in first inversion – bars 276 – 279) and the remote E minor are reached midpoint in the development. In this sense, the finale seems to be a compression of the important key relationships of the first movement: a remembering of the dangerous then safe expeditions from the same source – C.

Christopher Lewis believes the finale of the *Eroica* to be one of the most “extraordinary” symphonic finales: the others being Beethoven’s Ninth and Brahms’ Fourth.²⁸⁵ Lewis suggests this is largely because the movements are in variation form – sonata form’s “artistic antithesis” – but that another type of duality is grafted onto the variation scheme to evoke drama: in the case of the *Eroica*, Lewis believes this duality to be thematic. Yet this does not effectively encapsulate the other aspects of the movement which also contribute to this “extraordinariness.” Brown writes: “Beethoven captures the heroic character [of the variation theme] at the end with a summary of its various facets and a mighty

transformation of the *Prometheus* melody.” 286 Yet the power also lies in the unity of the symphony as a whole, and some of the final loose ends of unification are left until the finale. Brown writes:

> The unity of the “Eroica” Symphony goes far beyond its topic and principal melodic material. The openings of each movement unfold in an extraordinary manner. The primary, secondary and tertiary keys of each movement are manipulated to fit into a larger cyclic complex. Previous to the “Eroica,” unity of key was a given; it now becomes an organic concept. The individual movements are stretched over wider expanses by avoiding complete closure and by delaying the realizations of earlier implications. It is this inevitability of Beethoven’s ideas in the “Eroica” and their extensions that set a new concept for symphonic composition. 287

However, Lewis is correct that even an “extraordinary” symphonic finale (such as the examples he mentions) is not simply a re-conception of the symphony in which the high point is moved to the end: the first movement is still the weightiest because of the sheer tonicising force of sonata form – the *Eroica*, and other works which use this model, posit the immanent dominant in the first movement. As this immanent dominant has occurred, no transcendent dominant action is necessary. Furthermore, the success of a finale of this type also relies on the acceptance of the status quo: that is, the *Eroica* finale accepts the tonic – the tonicisation of which has occurred in the first sonata form movement – and does not attempt to dramatise the process again. The movements cited by Lewis modulate little (or not at all in the case of Brahms’ fourth) and utilise tonic together with more neutral subdominant axis members when they do. The employment of variation form reasserts the notion that a finale is a resolution of an entire work, due to its “flat” tonal state. However, Beethoven’s Ninth is a special example: it is a work in which the finale cannot be discussed without a

---
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full understanding of the compositional procedures going on in the earlier movements. However, the problem that Beethoven was grappling with in the Ninth was one of symphonic weight.

The Distribution of Symphonic Weight

When discussing the *Eroica*, it becomes evident that one of the features that preoccupies analysts is the sheer size and impact of the work. Monumentality becomes a crucial issue for nineteenth century composers, particularly those of symphonic works, with the seeds of the issue evident even in Mozart. With the will to monumentality grew the problem of the finale (itself a subset of the Doctrine of Originality as espoused by Dahlhaus). However, by the second age of the Symphony, composers felt the finale problem so strongly that many turned to one movement form, such as Liszt with his Symphonic poems. Wagner stated that if he were to compose symphonically after *Parsifal*, then the works must be in one movement because of the obstacle of the finale. The crux of the finale “problem” is that sonata form is such a strong tonicising force in itself that any following movements lack tonal drama in comparison.

Classical sonata form multi-movement works had always been first movement heavy, but the balance issue only arose when first-movement sonata form was expanded to the lengths which we see in Mozart (see the following footnote) and in Beethoven’s symphonies and chamber works. Discussing Mozart, Rosen explains: “The problem of the finale is naturally one of weight, of sufficient seriousness and dignity to balance the opening movement, but there would be no problem at all if it were not for the classical conception of the finale as a

---

288 See, for example, Mozart’s C major and G minor Quintets and their discussion by Rosen. Rosen, *The Classical Style*, 274.


resolution of the entire work.”291 Furthermore, “the limit of dramatic complexity in a classical finale is reached with Mozart’s G minor Symphony: despairing and impassioned, it is also rhythmically one of the simplest and squarest pieces that Mozart ever wrote.”292

As we have discussed, many of Beethoven’s symphonic and chamber works offer “solutions” to the problem. However, Rosen mentions that Beethoven’s coda to the finale of the F minor Quartet Op. 95 “has often seemed irrelevant, if not positively frivolous.”293 Rosen’s response to this finale says less about the actual finale itself than the size and complexity of the movements which it follows. The finale problem manifests itself most strongly in monumental, emotionally intense or tragic works. A classical conception of the finale as resolving the tensions of the work whilst attaining metrical regularity and major modality is simply not enough to follow the emotional power and complexity that Beethoven was able to wring out of a sonata form first movement, such as the Eroica, and Kerman touches on this when he compares Beethoven’s String Quartet Op. 59 No. 1 to the Eroica:

These are exactly the two main masterpieces of Beethoven, I think, that wrestle most seriously with the problem of the individuation of single movements. One feels after the first movement of the Eroica much as one feels after the first or second movement of the quartet – that so exhaustive an experience has been conveyed, and in so many facets, as to make any further communication superfluous. . . the later movements are set awkwardly for the total impression.294 It is important to note, however, that the correlative of the finale problem is the conception of the symphony as a unit, as opposed to the eighteenth-century notion of a group of pieces in related keys following a predictable format.

292 Ibid., 275.
293 Ibid., 274.
Eighteenth-century concerts would regularly break symphonies into various movements; this is now almost unthinkable nowadays, but it was the norm at that time.²⁹⁵ Yet, it is likely that by the end of their compositional careers both Haydn and Mozart were beginning to conceptualise a more teleological symphonic model, and it is this that Beethoven draws on; more importantly though, it is this model that mediates our hearing today. As Scott Burnham writes:

> The discomfort of earlier critics [of the *Eroica* finale] and the belaboured justifications of later critics are both occasioned by the attitude that a finale must somehow resolve the entire work. The case of the reception of the *Eroica* finale shows the depth of our attachment to the end-orientation model. This way of understanding Beethoven’s musical process clearly arises from the strong instances of several of the first movements and from the four-movement design of the Fifth Symphony.²⁹⁶

In lay terms, this was a problem Beethoven created, and which Beethoven – on the evidence of his later works – took it upon himself to solve.

The centering of the dramatic weight in a first movement may seem to account for an unsatisfactory finale, such as in some reviews of the *Eroica* as mentioned above. However, Kerman is flattering in his reasoning: regarding Beethoven’s String Quartet Op. 59 No. 1, he states that by this point in his career Beethoven was composing “individual movements so terrific that [he] cannot always face them one to the next.”²⁹⁷ He suggests that the reason for this is the unprecedented length and breadth of the *Eroica*, which “marked a . . . radical deepening of the terms of the problem, which was bound to delay its solution.” Regardless of details, however, the concept of any sonata form finale is problematic simply if

²⁹⁶ Burnham, *Beethoven Hero*, 60.
²⁹⁷ Kerman, *The Beethoven Quartets*, 341.
tonicisation has occurred in the first movement. Even if the issue is one of symphonic weight as opposed to sonata form specifically, front-weighting can be an issue: Michael Talbot notes that front-weighting works best when “the general dimensions are small and the disparities not too extreme. Once a listener becomes consciously aware that a first movement is long, expectations for the length of the rest are raised.”\textsuperscript{298} Talbot considers that in (for example) the opening movements of Bach’s “English” Suites “whilst magnificent in their own right, do nevertheless tend to overshadow and thereby devalue the rest of the cycle [emphasis mine].”\textsuperscript{299} The dissatisfaction we may sometimes sense in a Classical finale may be because the first movement, however brilliant, has effectively devalued the rest of the work. (It might rightly be asked whether the works were conceived as a set, or intended to be played individually, but considering the pieces as a unit, the observation remains.)

In most cases we can sense which movement possesses symphonic weight aurally, but it is important to define exactly what we mean by this. Talbot notes that weight includes aspects of length (potentially in bar numbers but more importantly in time), instrumentation (in fullness etc.) and tone (or seriousness). Yet these factors may all be mediated by other elements, and the only consistently significant feature of movements which possess symphonic weight is “complexity of form.”\textsuperscript{300} “The number of significant events in a movement – its rhythmic harmonic and tonal changes, as well as the thematic and textural pattern woven by the composer – has relevance for its weight.”\textsuperscript{301} The attainment and fleshing out of the structural dominant ties in with these “significant events”,

\textsuperscript{298} Michael Talbot, \textit{The Finale in Western Instrumental Music} (New York: Oxford University Press, 2001), 47.
\textsuperscript{299} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{300} Ibid., 45.
\textsuperscript{301} Ibid.
in which case, we might consider the immanent dominant as one of the most significant events.

However, this is not to suggest that it is impossible to write a fulfilling finale after an extended sonata form first movement: rather, that expanded dimensions in previous movements mean a rethinking will be required particularly in the extended symphonic works of the nineteenth century.

A summary of the *Eroica* Model’s characteristics:

- Regular sonata form works in three or four movements;
- Structural Dominant (immanent dominant) established and prolonged in first movement;
- Central movements in tonic major/minor or subdominant major/minor;
- Axial relationships may be present, but are used to embellish/expand tonic and dominant key areas rather than delay dominant. No transcendent dominant necessary (though Beethoven experimented with one in the second Symphony);
- There may be an emphasis on the subdominant, or a transcendent/immanent subdominant (in the case of the *Eroica’s* second movement, there is an immanent subdominant);
- Finale in Rondo/Variation/Modified Sonata form;
- Overall impression is of “Classically” shaped work, formally (first movement the “heaviest”, finale conclusive but formally “lighter” or “squarer”).
Schubert’s Ninth Symphony

Schumann discovered Schubert’s “Great” C-Major Symphony and famously reviewed the work in 1840, twelve years after Schubert’s death.\textsuperscript{302} Claiming that “this symphony . . . had an effect among us like no other after the ones by Beethoven”\textsuperscript{303}, Schumann’s review notes particularly the “heavenly length” of the Symphony, which is largely achieved through axial expansion of traditional tonal areas.\textsuperscript{304} The following analysis by Downes demonstrates this (my modifications in square brackets):

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\textbf{Figure 3.3: Schubert, Symphony No. 9 (D 944). Adapted from Downes}\textsuperscript{305}
\begin{tabular}{ll}
[1 – 77] & C (with E minor and A-flat) I (with i\(\alpha\) and I\(\beta\)) \\
1 – 133 & C \hspace{1cm} I \\
134 – 173 & e – V of G \hspace{1cm} i\(\alpha\) – V of V \\
174 – 189 & G \hspace{1cm} V \\
190 – 227 & E-flat-e – V of G \hspace{1cm} V\(\beta\) – i\(\alpha\) – V/V \\
228 – 25 & G \hspace{1cm} V \\
254 – 35 & development section \\
356 – 39 & C \hspace{1cm} I \\
440 – 491 & c \hspace{1cm} i \\
492 – 509 & C \hspace{1cm} I \\
510 – 557 & A-flat – A – V of C \hspace{1cm} I\(\beta\) – iv\(\alpha\) – V of I \\
558 – 685 & C \hspace{1cm} I \\
\end{tabular}
\end{figure}

As mentioned earlier, Downes summarises Schubert’s technique:

For Schubert, the tonal interval of the major third clearly had the capacity for what could almost be called passive modulation. This property was exploited to

\textsuperscript{303} Ibid., 71.
\textsuperscript{304} Ibid., 63.
increase the breadth and scale of some of his later sonata-form works, without jeopardizing the set functions of the various structural sections. In other words, axial modulation allowed the expressive and constructive use of chromaticism at the deeper structural levels, without jeopardizing the ability of tonality to articulate form.306

The ability of tonality to articulate form is perhaps one of the best descriptions possible of sonata form. This movement is an excellent example of expansion via axial relatives whilst retaining a sense of proportion and traditional key relationships. E minor (iα) and E-flat (Vβ) are used extensively in the exposition, whilst A-flat (Iβ) and A minor are used in the recapitulation. Downes notes that although the use of E and E-flat in the exposition can be interpreted as Schenkerian third-related dividers, “they exhibit the ability of axial modulation to instigate structural expansion.”307 Downes also notes that E minor prolongs the tonic, C, whilst E-flat prolongs the dominant, G. At the end of the first tonal area, the music lingers on G, the dominant.308 Schubert then falls to E-flat major (Vβ). The introduction of new thematic material confirms this as a second subject area, setting up the expected sonata form duality: this is established, and the immanent dominant is attained. A similar process occurs in Schubert’s C major Quintet, and the effect of such prolongation is crucial, as Downes explains:

The E-flat episode emphasises the axial substitution at the foreground level as G major repeatedly threatens to take over. The overall breadth of this section and indeed the movement as a whole is largely made possible by this axis substitution and the subsequent inter-axial dialogue between E-flat and G before the true dominant G is established.309

Though Schubert famously experimented with wrong key recapitulations, the analysis of this movement suggests that he was primarily concerned with expansive and colouristic qualities afforded by axial modulation. The consistency

306 Ibid., 32.
307 Ibid., 30.
308 Ibid.
309 Ibid.
of Schubert’s major-third relative use suggests that these keys had properties that prolonged tonal areas as he desired.

However, two aspects are absolutely crucial to this analysis: 1) the structural “immanent” dominant is attained and substantiated, as in the *Eroica* model, and 2) the movement is proportional in relation to itself. For example, the enormous *Andante* introduction is balanced by the large coda: “As in Beethoven’s Symphony No. 5/1, the coda provides a climax to the movement; but here, it balances and intensifies the structure of the slow introduction, not of the development section.”\(^{310}\) I will now examine how this might be balanced by later movements.

The second movement is an *Andante con moto* in A minor. It is in a type of modified sonata form, which Brown describes as “modified Sonata Rondo.”\(^{311}\) Its exposition section modulates from A minor to F major: further evidence for axial tonality being used to expand traditional tonal areas. The development-type section is more remote, modulating from A minor to D-sharp/E-flat and then to B-flat (I – IV/IV\(\beta\) – IV\(\beta\)). These are tonal centers that are “flat” – they do not provide (and do not need to provide) any dominant. Instead, interest is sustained through the sudden shifts of dynamic. The recapitulation begins in A major then turns to A minor.

The Scherzo is an Allegro Vivace in C major, styled as another modified sonata rondo.\(^{312}\) The development begins in A-flat (I\(\beta\)), and other modulations are axially related. What is particularly interesting, however, is the reception of the later two movements of this Symphony, which will be touched on after my


\(^{311}\) Ibid.

\(^{312}\) Ibid., 637.
analysis of the finale. Although Schubert’s ending is in the realm of the “apotheosis” finale (like the finale to Beethoven’s Seventh Symphony), Brown suggests it is still well handled, though he is reserved in his adulation. He states that this finale is sustained by “rhythmic drive, thematic power, and long-range tonal control.”313 Again, this is a movement in sonata form, though modified: the recapitulation separates tonal and thematic return: “The recapitulation and coda depart radically from the expected tonal thrust, even if we are willing to accept beginning the recapitulation outside the tonic key as within the range of Schubertian normalcy.”314

A contemporary review of the Symphony’s first performance hinted at the inherent problems of Classical form and the continuation of the *Eroica* model into the mid-to-late nineteenth century: “Overall, the first two movements appeared to be generally the most interesting.”315 This suggests (as readers will now be familiar) a lack of tonal drama following the sonata form of the first movement and lyricism of the second, although the reviewer has his own thoughts:

Conceivably, this [impression] could have resulted from the fact that the listener’s attention was not yet exhausted by the all-too-long duration of each movement. Still, it seemed to us that the first movements did indeed deserve preference over the last, since the Scherzo was all too repetitive, and the final movement resembled an opera finale without words.316

Further to this, Brown writes “This pace and the prolonged length [of the finale] cause the grand pauses and cessations of movement to be concessions to exhaustion, not only for the imaginary dances but also for the violinists who,

313 Ibid., 638.
314 Ibid., 639.
315 Ibid., 631.
316 Anonymous review in *Allgemeine Musikalische Zeitung* (Leipzig) XLI/13 (March 27, 1839), cols. 256 – 57, quoted in ibid., 631.
during the nineteenth century and today, find its repetitive figuration straining.”  

Evidently, form and symphonic weight were core issues that concerned nineteenth-century composers. The increased emphasis on the finale – and consequently less on the opening movements – became common, and we have discussed a number of possible reasons for this. However, it is important to examine the works of later nineteenth-century composers. Which models did composers draw on? Did they make use of transcendent and immanent dominants? How effective were their solutions? Here, each model is individually examined and summarised.

Models

- We have examined the traditional sonata-form model used by Beethoven in his first and second periods, both paradigmatically in the *Eroica* Symphony, and in countless other classical works. This type of work is front-weighted, with a first movement in sonata form. This model perseveres well into the nineteenth century, for example in some of Brahms’ output. Brahms did avail himself to this model in certain works, though many others indicate he was aware of alternatives; in fact, Brahms contributes musical examples to most tropes discussed in this thesis. Structural or immanent dominants seem to make transcendent ones redundant, if we take the classical model of I – IV (vi) – I – I across four movements as the norm.

- However, Beethoven’s late period sees the development of other models. The String Quartet Op. 127 in E-flat places the clearest manifestation of the structural dominant at the end of the work, in the finale, though there are hints of
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317 Ibid., 638.
318 See, for example, the Quartet Op. 67, the Fourth Symphony, and the Clarinet Quintet Op. 115.
it within the third movement. Harmonic tension continues through the first two movements by use of tonic and subdominant axial relatives, whilst the finale is a straightforward sonata form; here, the dominant becomes reified in its immanent form. No transcendent dominant is at work here.

- The String Quartet Op. 131 in C-sharp minor is similar, but instead reserves the dominant until the penultimate movements, the fifth and sixth, before the dramatic finale. The effect is more end-weighted, and thus in this work the arrival of the structural dominant gains more force because of its previous, conspicuous, absence. Here, the fifth and sixth movements create the transcendent dominant (using $V_β$ and $v$ respectively). These movements are transcendent in that they support the notion of being part of a dominant of the entire work, whilst there is an immanent dominant in the sonata form finale.

- We might describe the Hammerklavier Piano Sonata Op. 106 in B-flat as a mono-axial model. Though there is a contrast between the keys of B-flat major and minor of the first two movements and the F-sharp minor of the slow movement, the keys share an axis and there is no transcendent dominant. Rather than positing the immanent dominant within the final movement itself, Beethoven places it in the finale’s slow introduction: a remarkably un-dramatic solution to the finale problem.

- The Cello Sonata Op. 102 is the final example, and I describe this model as proto-progressive.319 A small opening movement in a weakly tonicised key is overwhelmed by a disproportionate emphasis on the subdominant area, with the initial tonality only “rescued” in the final movement. This technique imbues the music with drama and gives it a sense of activity. Though it is not actually progressive, in that it does not begin in one key and end in another, the significance of the tonic displacement gives a similar, if less dramatic effect.

---

suggest that the weak statement of the tonic key at the opening sets up a requirement for dominant establishment later in the work. A similar effect occurs in Beethoven’s Op. 101 Piano Sonata, and Schumann’s String Quartet Op. 41 No. 1.

While some of the techniques discussed here may seem remarkably similar, the effects are subtly different. As we shall see, there are multiple solutions to the problem of the finale: the selection and crafting of different models and the success of such depends on whether a composer chooses to reserve the dominant then “strike with his best weapons” later in the work, or craft flat movements that rely on contrapuntal complexity to sustain them. Beethoven drew on such solutions himself. Any discussion of form in the nineteenth century is bound to be circumpolar and thorny: nevertheless, it is a discussion worth delving into for the plethora of compositional procedures that Franck was undoubtedly aware of; procedures which he selected or modified to service his architectonic needs.
Chapter Four

Late Beethovenian Models

This chapter examines more closely some of the important works Beethoven composed in his late period; those works which have motivated formal models other composers have drawn on.

Beethoven’s Ninth Symphony

The Ninth Symphony is a paradigm that illustrates Beethoven’s preoccupation with tonality and form in his late period. A. Peter Brown discusses this here:

Establishing a tonality was a problem Beethoven pursued throughout his creative life. Tonality was not to be assumed, but proven. Before the Ninth, the beginning of a movement gave strong indications of what was to be accomplished or at least set forth a tonal orbit if only temporarily, but the Ninth begins further removed from these premises.320

This may be linked to the avoidance of root position dominants at critical junctures in the Ninth Symphony, such as bars 33 – 35 in which Iβ supplants i, or bars 116 – 119, in which the harmony is dyadic rather than triadic, and hence functionally ambiguous. Cosima Wagner writes about this feature in her diary: “A work such as [the Ninth] remains a mystery; R. [Wagner] says how remarkable in B. [Beethoven] is the hatred of trivialities, the avoidance of dominants, for example, and the enormous artistic instinct.”321 There are many 6/4 chords, for example, but the music seems to “fail” instead of asserting itself with the expected cadential event that this chord historically presages. Two

important examples include the first important cadence into D minor (bar 17) – actually a D minor 6/4 chord – and the hammered cadence into B-flat at bar 150, where only B-flats and Ds are present. There is a link here to the Schreckensfanfare (mentioned previously), built from both a B-flat major and D minor chord. Though the remainder of this chapter is concerned with chamber and piano works, we know that Beethoven is preoccupied with tonality and functionality in symphonic and chamber works – and the voicing of chords is one way in which keys can be affirmed or weakened.

**String Quartet in E-flat Major, Op. 127**

The E-flat major Quartet illustrates Beethoven’s preoccupation with the distribution of what Downes describes as “symphonic weight”. Kerman considers that the weight of the E-flat major Quartet is central, lying in the slow movement. The second movement, in expanded variation form, sees “the hymn-variation in E major serve as a spiritual climax for the whole quartet.” Spiritual climax though it may be, the following analysis suggests that the weight in terms of background tonicisation falls later. The third movement, the Scherzo, contains an immanent dominant, but – crucially – Beethoven does not allow it to function as such: instead, the finale contains the true immanent dominant. Hence the I – V – I process has been drawn over the course of the Quartet. The principle of contrast is also important, a principle which preoccupied Beethoven more and more in his final period. Whilst the first movement of this Quartet attempts to minimise contrast (somewhat, as Kerman states, a contradiction in sonata form) the Scherzando vivace maximises contrast in both key and rhythmic structure.

---

324 Similarly, the emotional core of the B-flat Quartet Op. 130 lies in the slow movement. Ibid., 241.
325 Ibid., 228.
This principle may also help in deducing which movements Beethoven intended to be structurally dramatic or non-dramatic.

**Figure 4.1: Beethoven, String Quartet (Op. 127), I.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maestoso</th>
<th>Allegro</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 – 6 E-flat I</td>
<td>7 – 32 E-flat I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>First subject – sounds like an ending phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33 – 40 E-flat – G I – Iα</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fragments of first subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41 – 68 G minor iα</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Second subject with strong cadence 64-65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>69 – 74 G major Iα</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maestoso</strong></td>
<td><strong>Allegro</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 – 80 G major Iα</td>
<td>81 – 97 G major Iα</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Development/use of 1st subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>98 – 116 C minor ivα</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fragments of 1st subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>117 – 120 A-flat major IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Briefly more stable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>121 – 124 A dim IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Outlines dim 7 in Violin 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>125 – 128 B-flat minor v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Briefly more stable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>129 – 132 B dim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Similar to 121 – 124 but a tone higher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>133 – 134 C major IVα</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arrival: this is a climax point, and links with the end of the finale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maestoso</strong></td>
<td><strong>Allegro</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135 – 138 C major IVα</td>
<td>139 – 146 C major IVα</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>First subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>147 – 158 Progression to A-flat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In A-flat: vii/ii – ii – V 7; fragmentary figure rising in First Violin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>159 – 166 A-flat, but sequence continues and A-flat becomes IV of E-flat at bar 167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>167 – 174 E-flat I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Statement of first subject in tonic key</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>175 – 182 E-flat I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Derivative of first subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>182 – 198 Progression / preparation for A-flat or E-flat – A-flat eventuates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In A-flat: V7 – I9&lt;– V7c – I7 – vii7/vi – vi7 – V7 – I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>198 – 206 A-flat IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Second subject melodically – plagal pre – I</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
207 – 221  E-flat & A-flat  I & IV  Tonic pedal
222 – 230  E-flat  I  More firmly – no D-flats. Cadence into E-flat:
231 – 238  B-flat as V  V  Ending cadential figure from bar 65
239 – 270  E-flat, but lots of emphasis on key of A-flat – almost ‘rocking’ plagally at times
271 – 282  E-flat – now more stable, but pianissimo

Of the first movement, Kerman writes: “The phrase structure of the exposition seems unbelievably simple, hardly conducive to dramatic tension”\textsuperscript{326} and further that “no quartet fast movement in Beethoven moves so lyrically as this one.”\textsuperscript{327} This is likely, I suggest, because Beethoven is specifically aiming for tranquility, plotting to place dramatic emphasis elsewhere. Kerman also suggests that “this movement lives not on contrast but on the inherent beauty of the consequent doublet phrase.”\textsuperscript{328} The simplicity is brought about by an antecedent-consequent phrase, which “passes from force to gentleness”: an arpeggio figure answered by a lyric doublet phrase.\textsuperscript{329}

\textbf{Figure 4.2: Beethoven, String Quartet (Op. 127), I, bars 7 – 14}

Also notable is that the first subject – the doublet theme itself – begins with a harmony on the subdominant, which reinforces the emphasis on the subdominant key in this movement, particularly toward the end. But the figuration of the opening arpeggio figure is also significant: none of the dominant chords appear in root position, instead being crafted with the fifth, then seventh,

\textsuperscript{326} Ibid., 205.
\textsuperscript{327} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{328} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{329} Ibid., 204.
in the bass (a link may be inferred here between Op. 127 and the first movement of the Ninth Symphony – see the above discussion).

This arpeggio figure is employed to start the development in G, or Iα. Kerman suggests the key is “chosen to contrast as little as possible”\(^\text{330}\), telling, as E-flat and G share the same axis.\(^\text{331}\) Beethoven reinforces this lack of drama in the development section by use of canon, achieving “a thoroughly novel quality of flatness.”\(^\text{332}\) Likewise, the use of G major (Iα) and C major (IVα), avoid the drama of the dominant axis. Given this purposeful avoidance, we might describe the movement as “non-tonicising” sonata form.\(^\text{333}\) Kerman also adds that “The blustering passages go nowhere and develop nothing significantly”.\(^\text{334}\) There has certainly been no immanent dominant, which is in reserve to appear in a later movement (or movements).

**Figure 4.3: Beethoven, String Quartet (Op. 127), II.**

II

A-flat Major (IV overall)

*Adagio, ma non troppo e molto cantabile*

**First Variation:** 1 – 20  A-flat  I

Very spacious and lyrical. The only accidentals present are the D natural (in V/V, 9 – 10), an occasional G-flat (creating v, I\(^7\)) and D natural (creating vii/V, 19).

**Second Variation:** 20 – 39  A-flat  I

A few more chromatic nuances happening now. Local tonicisation of F minor (27).

*Andante con moto*

**Third Variation:** 39 – 59  A-flat  I

\(^{330}\) Ibid., 209. Kerman seems to be hinting at an axial interpretation without fully expounding it; his language often points to the neutrality that axial theory posits.

\(^{331}\) This is one of many occasions where Kerman’s turn of phrase seems to prefigure axial theory.

\(^{332}\) Kerman, *The Beethoven Quartets*, 206.

\(^{333}\) Non-tonicising sonata form can be described as a form that has the traditional schematic subdivisions but no structural dominant.

More lively, staccato feel, though still relaxed. Tonic minor appearing occasionally (i.e. 44).
Emphatic moment on D-flat minor (50) perhaps to signal an enharmonic pivot for what is to come. (D-flat minor enharmonically C-sharp minor).

*Adagio molto espressivo*

**Fourth Variation:** 60 – 77 E major \( \text{I}^\beta \) (in context of whole quartet, \( \text{IV}^\beta \))

Rhythmic change from 12/8 to 4/4. Similar transition to Op. 131 between 1\(^{st}\) and 2\(^{nd}\) movements. Forte on Cmaj7 in 67, 71, 75 (l.a.) Transition back simply by E natural, falls to E-flat in bar 78.

*Tempo I*

**Fifth Variation:** 78 – 100 A-flat major \( \text{I} \)

Back in 12/8 tempo. At 96 things start changing – touch on D-flat, B-flat minor is suggested, then E-flat minor, before transition to C-sharp minor between bars 100 – 101.

**Sixth Variation** 101 – 107 C-sharp minor \( \text{iv} \) (enharmonically)

Similarly iambic as before, though not quite as hushed as the E major variation. Mode shifts to A major at 107.

Continued . . . 108 – 118 A-flat major \( \text{I} \)

Mainly straightforward and diatonic. Ends with an imperfect cadence at bar 118.

**Coda** 119 – 127 A-flat major \( \text{I} \)

120: A-flat7 – D-flat second inversion – Preparation for I, but then moves to D-flat minor – E major – V7b – E major (contraction) – then moderate scale I6/4 – V – I including the tonic minor. Slow and tender ending, with B-flat falling to A-flat in the bass.

This *Adagio ma non troppo e molto cantabile* is the longest movement, and arguably the centerpiece of the Quartet.\(^{335}\) Kerman emphasises its importance: “Both works [Op. 127 and Op. 132] bank more heavily on their slow movements than any other of the quartets, earlier or later . . . even in absolute terms the Adagio . . . stands out as the most monumental of Beethoven’s variation movements.”\(^{336}\) The movement is in A B A form. The melody is opulently lyrical, and Kerman describes the climax of the melody as being the subdominant touch in bar 17 – important, as the subdominant is the most structurally significant key in this

---

\(^{335}\) Ibid.

\(^{336}\) Ibid., 226.
Variations one and two constitute the first section, variation three the second, and variations four five and six the last. The design is symmetrical, setting it apart from the variation forms of other quartets. Harmonic relationships utilise the tonic and subdominant as well as their axial relatives: the A section is in A-flat; the B section is in E major (Iβ of this movement) moved to by “a spasm” without preparation; variation four returns “just as abruptly” to A-flat; variation five emphasises the subdominant, D-flat minor; and variation six returns to the tonic. Despite this movement being the emotional core of the Quartet, the tonal scheme consists entirely of tonic and subdominant axis members relative to A-flat.

Relative to the Quartet as a whole this movement represents a significant prolongation of the subdominant axis. In this, it seems we have discovered a new category: the transcendent subdominant, where the subdominant section of the work as a whole is embodied within a movement, as it is here. This also possibly links with Beethoven’s Op. 130 quartet, in which the Cavatina plays a similar role emotionally and, in conjunction with the G major Alla danza tedesca before it, represents a transcendent subdominant phase of the work. Regarding Op. 127, it is unlikely that the size of this movement would have been possible had the first movement been a traditional sonata allegro with structural dominant. Discussing another monumental slow movement – that of the Hammerklavier – Downes writes that:

The salient point here is whether or not a slow movement of this length would be possible in a work where the tonic had been already outlined at the background structural level . . . such a movement would be inappropriate because it would have no tonal function to perform. . . . the tension created by the as yet unfulfilled

---

337 Ibid., 212.
338 Ibid., 214.
339 Ibid.
340 Ibid.
background tonicisation is conceivably what sustains the Adagio’s enormous length.\textsuperscript{341}

We can also apply this observation to the Quartet Op. 127. This work shows Beethoven stretching his refusal to act tonally to extreme lengths and the extended slow movements in each work show both the functional and lyrical ends made possible by withholding the structural dominant.

It is also important to note the subtle thematic allusions between the end of the second movement and the beginning of the third. Four bars before the end, the second movement outlines a $I - V - I$ progression in E. What seems to be happening is a prefiguring of the point in the work where the music will become tonally active; where the structural dominant will eventuate. Beethoven uses a similar device in the String Quartet Op. 131: in that case, the semiquaver cello figure in variation six thematically prefigures the Scherzo; similarly, the cello arpeggio in the coda of the same movement rhythmically prefigures the finale.

From these allusions, it seems that Beethoven is at pains to communicate – at a foreground thematic level – the shift from passive to active function in the work as a whole.

\textbf{Figure 4.4: Beethoven, String Quartet (Op. 127), III.}

\begin{center}
\textit{Scherzando vivace}
\end{center}

\begin{tabular}{llll}
1 – 2 & E-flat – B-flat & I & V & Declaratory chords: $I - V - I - V$ \\
2 – 17 & E-flat & I & & First subject (B-flat, E-flat) \\
17 – 25 & E-flat & I & & Continuation/repeat 1\textsuperscript{st} subject \\
26 – 36 & Transition to B-flat & V & & Touch on C minor (31) but becomes $ii$ of $ii\text{-}V-I$ in B-flat. 2 – 36 repeated. \\
36 – 40 & Backward cycle of fifths & & & Vicious dotted motive in unison
\end{tabular}

suggesting backward cycle of 5ths: ends on G (V/C minor)

| 41 – 46 | C minor  | ivα | Inverted first subject |
| 47 – 50 | F minor  | WT/I (v/V) | Fragments first subject |
| 51 – 55 | D-flat   | WT/I (vβ/V) | Fragments first subject |
| 56 – 59 | V/flatten – E-flat minor – transition, somewhere between E-flat minor and G-flat |
| 60 – 69 | Vicious dotting: through G-flat (Vβ) – C-flat (IV/Vβ) – G-flat – D-flat (V/Vβ) – F-sharp minor (Vβ) – D (Va): then suggesting V / I / V but ending on a unison E-flat, which turns into SD6 of G minor |

**Allegro**

| 70 – 74 | G minor  | iα | In 2/4 – definite disruption |
| **Tempo I** | |
| 75 – 77 | vii7/G   | vii7/iα | Fragments first subject |

**Allegro**

| 78 – 80 | As 70 – 74 |

**Tempo I**

| 81 – 84 | V/F       | V/V/V | Fragments first subject |
| 85 – 89 | F         | V/V   | Fragments and – re-transition to 1st sub. |
| 90 – 112 | E-flat    | I     | Full first subject – harmony v. similar |
| 113 – 115 | VI – ii – V in E-flat: altered harmony from first *Ritmo di tre battute* |
| 116 – 118 | Extension of 113 – 115 |
| 119 – 122 | E-flat    | I     | Big cadence with downward scale figure |
| 122 – 141 | E-flat    | I     | First subject becomes ending figure. |
|           |           |       | Tonic pedal from 129 – 137. C-flats in texture (♭ VI – V trills in first violin.) |
| 142 – 143 | E-flat minor | i | 2nd beat chord changes abruptly from major to tonic minor |

**Presto** *(Key change: E-flat minor)*

| 167 – 173 | Suggests D-flat | WT/1 | C naturals in texture – unison |
| 174 – 185 | D-flat | WT/1 |
| 186 – 189 | V/B-flat | V/V |
190 – 200  B-flat minor  v  As bar 148, but in the tonic minor
201 – 207  Transition – around E-flat minor/G-flat major
208 – 219  G-flat major  Vβ  As bar 174
220 – 223  V/E-flat  V
224 – 236  E-flat minor  i  As bar 148, but instead of going to IV there is a transition back to the major beginning with the dominant major (B-flat) which appears from 235.

(Key change: E-flat major)

237 – 268  V/E-flat  V  Dominant preparation for tonic return, but odd notes above dominant pedal from 260 – 268: 9ths, 2nds: bar 269 is A-C-E-flat over B-flat!

269 – 272  Transition to restatement of original material: inversion of first subject in the dominant

273 – 414  As opening section – Presto

Presto

415 – 426  Truncation of earlier Presto – i – V

Tempo I

428 – 435  Little cadential statement – ending on I

So, how might Beethoven follow such a monumental slow movement; how to sustain this feeling, this breadth? Though the slow movement was extended and weighty, there are still two movements to follow, and we are awaiting the structural dominant. Following the slow movement is the Scherzando Vivace, back in the tonic E-flat. This opens with four emphatic chords, then a fugue, with the subject in the dominant, answer in inversion, then short episodes.342 Kerman suggests that although the late quartets – including Op. 127 – are remarkable for their integration, “contrasts – within movements or between movements – may be more extraordinary than ever.” 343 This movement certainly contrasts the

---

342 Kerman, The Beethoven Quartets, 230.
343 Ibid., 229.
previous two, but more significantly, it contains a failed immanent dominant. There are instances of the dominant, to be sure, such as hints at the end of the opening statement and at bar 60, G-flat being Vβ. However neither instance is prolonged (it collapses back into E-flat minor at bar 224): a vital condition for the attainment of the immanent dominant is a degree of prolongation, which is here denied. In this, we can consider the immanent dominant as synonymous with the Schenkerian structural dominant. The Trio’s tonal scheme is I – V (double bar) VII – v – III – V – I (returning to the tonic in the repeat). Bars 37 – 59 feature a sequence traversing C minor, F minor, B-flat minor and D-flat major, before arriving at G-flat major (Vβ) in bar 60. Four bars later this swings to F-sharp minor, acting as a pivot v of G minor which arrives at bar 70. After a cycle of fifths, we arrive back at E-flat major. The trio at bar 148 employs the tonic minor, the antithesis of tonal contrast.

Yet it is important to realise that in this movement the dominant becomes manifest in a stronger way, with root position chords (as opposed to the inverted chord used frequently up till this point) and becomes a more significant harmonic center. Yet there seems to be a correlation between Beethoven’s introduction of the dominant (in a “failed” immanent fashion) and a lack of emotional seriousness: for example, in Scherzo movements. The dominant is then “absorbed” into a more formal context in the final movement, but its introduction is usually off-hand. This is true of both Op. 127 and Op. 131.

Figure 4.5: Beethoven, String Quartet (Op. 127), IV.

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 – 4</td>
<td>Chromatic opening</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 – 36</td>
<td>E-flat</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>First subject group. Naturals in both melody and texture – some foreground tonicisation of B-flat (V).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

344 Ibid., 233.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bar Range</th>
<th>Key and Chord</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>37 – 44</td>
<td>E-flat I</td>
<td>First subject – fragmented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 – 54</td>
<td>B-flat V</td>
<td>Transition to dominant - first subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 – 66</td>
<td>B-flat V</td>
<td>Second subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67 – 72</td>
<td>Transition</td>
<td>Emphasising unison G, D, E-flat, F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73 – 80</td>
<td>C7 chord – F7 V/V (in B-flat)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81 – 96</td>
<td>Transition suggesting B-flat – E-flat then E-flat augmented, before C minor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97 – 100</td>
<td>As Chromatic opening</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101 – 105</td>
<td>E-flat to F minor (briefly)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106 – 110</td>
<td>C7 chord (suggesting more F minor) but then V/C7 in 110 becoming:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111 – 120</td>
<td>C minor ivα or vi</td>
<td>Second subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121 – 124</td>
<td>C minor – C major ivα – IVα</td>
<td>First subject – chromatic alteration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125 – 134</td>
<td>On C7 – two brief glimpses of F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135 – 144</td>
<td>Transition: first suggesting F minor, Sequence through F minor, E-flat major, D-flat major, before returning to E-flat to become V/A-flat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145 – 160</td>
<td>A-flat IV</td>
<td>False recapitulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161 – 176</td>
<td>A-flat IV</td>
<td>Second aspect of first subject, but ending on a diminished chord in bar 176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>177 – 186</td>
<td>Transition back to tonic – rising tones to some degree in all voices</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>187 – 218</td>
<td>E-flat I</td>
<td>Entire first subject group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>219 – 226</td>
<td>E-flat I</td>
<td>Second subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>227 – 230</td>
<td>B-flat V</td>
<td>Transitory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>231 – 236</td>
<td>As at 67, but down a fifth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>237 – 244</td>
<td>F7 chord (suggesting V/V) but this is only a quick transition to the tonic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>245 – 250</td>
<td>E-flat I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>251 – 255</td>
<td>B-flat7 – B dim (vii7/C) – C minor – C major</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Allegro con moto</em> (Key change: C major)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>256 – 260</td>
<td>C IVα</td>
<td>Variant on first subject – 260 with #4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261 – 263</td>
<td>A-flat IV</td>
<td>Semitonal rise from G – A-flat, as above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>264 – 266</td>
<td>F-flat (E) IVβ</td>
<td>Completes sweep round axial cycle, cyclically recalling the slow movement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>267 – 268</td>
<td>Short transition through E-flat7 – A-flat – Ddim9 – E-flat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>269 – 272</td>
<td>E-flat I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Transition: all around E-flat, but pattern in bass moving through semitones then falling a major third.

E-flat I Variant on first subject – ff arrival
Cadential approach – p ff iteration – scales
E-flat I 293: trill on tonic chord punctuated with C-flats (♭VI). Also A naturals a few bars before the end.

As the emotional weight of the Quartet lies in the slow movement, and the failed immanent dominant has been introduced in the Scherzo, the finale is simple by necessity.\textsuperscript{345} The structure of the phrasing is simple, and there is little transitional material; a pair of statements in the tonic, followed by a pair in the dominant, without transition or modulation. G is also emphasised, as in the first movement. The sonata form is conventional and includes a false recapitulation in the subdominant at bar 153, again reinforcing both convention and the subdominant bias of the work as a whole.

Despite this simplicity, the finale is entrusted a crucial job – to flesh out the background structural dominant; the immanent dominant. Beethoven places this dominant at bar 183, and this gives us the crucial sense that the sonata form achieves prolongation. The recapitulation proper at bar 256 is of particular interest as it brings with it a glorious axial harmonic sequence: after restating the main theme, the harmony swings from C major through A-flat, E, and E-flat.\textsuperscript{346} This is nothing less than a sounding of the entire subdominant axis in one large sweep, through steps of a major third in the bass, and Kerman describes these bars as a “sheer dream.”\textsuperscript{347} Given the tonal regions touched on, we might interpret this moment as a revisiting of tonal regions used in the Adagio, the

\textsuperscript{345} Ibid., 234.
\textsuperscript{346} Ibid., 237.
\textsuperscript{347} Ibid., 238.
heart of the Quartet, and a reemphasis of the importance of the subdominant region in the Quartet as a whole. We might call this reemphasis the immanent subdominant; an echo of the transcendent subdominant that is the second movement. This subdominant emphasis is underpinned thematically as this section also recalls the Adagio in its use of rising sevenths and octaves in the melody in bars 259 – 260 and 262 – 263. This interval supplants the fourth used in the finale theme.

As shown, the first half of the Quartet is passive in that the tonicisation process is withheld. Beethoven seems to have calculated this lack of drama to allow him to expand the slow movement to its significant expressive length: in producing a non-tonicising agenda in the first movement, he could induce an acceptance of what, by classical standards, amounted to a proportional distortion of movement size. Kerman writes that the slow movement’s design is: “eloquent and weighty – another ‘expansion’ upon the delicate formal outlines of the first movement.”

The second half of the Quartet completes the tonicisation process, with the introduction of the dominant axis and the substantiation of the “failed” immanent dominant in the Scherzo by a tonally active sonata form finale with a “successful” immanent dominant. It is as though a single sonata movement has been stretched – albeit loosely – across the entire Quartet.

**String Quartet in C-sharp minor Op. 131**

If the fourth movement provides the immanent dominant in Op. 127, it is the seventh in Op. 131: the final movement. Yet, here there is a transcendent dominant – one that acts as the dominant of the entire work – in movements five and six. Hence the reservation of the structural dominant until late in the work, but interest and intensity are maintained by making use of axially related tonally

---

348Ibid., 241.
“flat” or neutral key areas, including the subdominant, and the crafting of the transcendent dominant in the penultimate and antepenultimate movements.\(^{349}\) In this way Op. 127 and Op. 131 are similar, though as we will see in Op. 131 Beethoven presents the structural dominant with more dramatic force. However, it is worthwhile surveying each movement individually to deduce Beethoven’s tonal scheme.

This Quartet opens with an expansive, mournful fugue. Though Beethoven experimented with withholding tonicisation in his later works (possibly but not necessarily as alternatives to sonata form), his use of a fugue as the first movement here is still unprecedented. If we consider that Beethoven’s tactic is again the withholding of dramatic weight, however, his use of fugue can be interpreted (and has been by Kerman) as a conscious effort to “eschew all the tired characteristics of sonata style . . . the ‘deflection’ of sonata form and the use of a fugue for an opening movement are different solutions to the same problem; that of the imbalance in the distribution of symphonic weight.”\(^{350}\) Kerman writes further:

An opening movement in sonata form could only have singled out one or two keys, dramatically stressed and nervously highlighted: the Neapolitan, let us say, plus the sixth degree. But a fugue can (and this one does superbly) map out with dispassionate authority an entire terrain, the whole circumscribed tonal field of the minor mode.\(^{351}\)

However, this description of sonata style as “tired” is problematic, as when the sonata allegro does arrive, it fulfils all the criteria of traditional sonata form with an opening i – V – i progression, a second subject in a dominant axis key, and

\(^{349}\) Kerman also refers to movement of Op. 131 as possessing an “underlying quality” of “flatness”. Ibid., 333.


\(^{351}\) Kerman, *The Beethoven Quartets*, 328.
dominant preparation prior to the recapitulation. Yet if we think in Schenkerian terms, this “deflection” of sonata style by use of fugue also comes hand in hand with abandonment (or rather a reserving) of the traditional tonic-dominant polarity. Perhaps instead of searching for an alternative to sonata form, Beethoven was simply keeping its inherent vitality and dramatic power in reserve. The notion is reinforced by the dominant’s late recurrence in Op. 127, Op. 131 and the Hammerklavier; it certainly seems to be a conscious architectural tactic on Beethoven’s part.

As the fugue avoids dominant and dominant axis keys, it has a feeling of tonal flatness. Kerman suggests v is tonicised at bars 34 – 35, but Downes strongly refutes this, as even the weak suggestion of B features a dominant pedal and weak perfect cadence, which the v “modulation” lacks.352 Beethoven clearly considers both keys to be of little importance, neither being firmly established (notably, the modulations which instigate key signature changes are those to C-sharp minor, E-flat minor, B, A and C-sharp minor). Reinforcing this tonal neutrality is the emphasis placed on the subdominant. The fugal answer is in F-sharp minor, and at bar 113 the tonic (C-sharp minor) turns to major, suggesting the possibility of C-sharp being heard as a dominant of F-sharp. The transition to the second movement heightens this ambiguity, where the bare C-sharp octaves that end the movement are reinterpreted as the leading note of the D, the Neapolitan and key of the second movement.353 The Neapolitan chords at the end of the fugue also contribute to the ambiguity of C-sharp and its potential reinterpretation of V of F-sharp. In a first movement, we would usually experience tonicisation of a given key via sonata form. Instead, we remain in

353 Ibid., 53.
doubt as to what the tonic actually is. Certainly, the entire minor mode has been mapped out in the fugue, but neither F-sharp nor C-sharp has been tonicised unequivocally.

Our uncertainty about the tonic continues in the second movement. The key is D (IV♭), and though sonata form is suggested with a move to the dominant, no further modulation ensues and the music leads back to the tonic. Kerman describes this as “sonata form without development”; we might also describe it as another “failed” immanent dominant. At bar 44 there is a C-sharp major chord, the use of the major mode again suggesting C-sharp could be a dominant rather than a tonic; this is not the only time Beethoven employs this technique in this quartet. Though this is only momentary, it reinforces C-sharp’s ambiguity and the potential of F-sharp to be the tonic. Downes states that “Beethoven is making a point of dramatising the axial substitution of D for F-sharp”, which in other words means a movement in F-sharp might be expected; however, by using D, the Neapolitan, Beethoven can emphasise the semitonal relationship between C-sharp and D. The use of the subdominant axis is formally logical given the beginning of this quartet possesses a tonic – subdominant bias, and the latter half a dominant – tonic bias. This it has in common with Op. 127 and Op. 106, which I will examine shortly.

The third movement is a short bridge in B minor. Kerman suggests the bridge has a functional use in that it avoids the slow movement (in A) sounding like the

---

354 Ibid., 52.
355 Kerman, The Beethoven Quartets, 331.
356 Beethoven uses a similar pairing in the Scherzo, where the tonic E is undermined by G-sharp major chords, such as in bar 10 and 19 – 20, where a G-sharp chord begins the second half of the main theme.
dominant of D, the key of the second movement.\footnote{Kerman, \textit{The Beethoven Quartets}, 334.} The bridge arguably ends on E major, the dominant of A (Iβ), which is the key of the fourth movement, the slow movement – a set of tonally “flat” variations. Reflecting on the movements thus far, Downes states that the “first half of the work is set to establish the tonal sequence I – IVβ – Iβ, successfully withholding any structural dominant either within or between any of the four movements.”\footnote{Downes, "An Axial System of Tonality Applied to Progressive Tonality in the Works of Gustav Mahler and Nineteenth Century Antecedents", 53.} This is the same tactic at play in Op. 127. However, the eighth variation of the slow movement brings some interesting harmonic movement indeed. At bar 231, the music turns from A major to C major or Vα. For Downes, the use of C major interrupts the predictable flow of the variations and heralds the arrival of more dominant axis sonorities which will soon become significant; a low level dominant that prefigures the immanent dominant still to come. He observes that “the expectation of the structural dominant is so strong now, as much on account of its absence up until this point as Beethoven’s arousing our appetite for it at the end of the Andante.”\footnote{Ibid.}

An E major (Vβ of C-sharp) Scherzo follows, with particular emphasis placed on G-sharp (the dominant of C-sharp) by way of fermatas. To Downes, this shows that the tonic – subdominant bias of the first half of the work has shifted to become a dominant – tonic bias.\footnote{Ibid., 52.} Although this dominant bias is becoming evident, our desire for tonicisation is not yet satisfied, partly because of the Scherzo’s lack of any dramatic content and the continued immanent subdominant relationship between the Scherzo and its subdominant trio. Furthermore, the I – V – I opening of the Scherzo is not composed out in the rest of the movement: the opening antecedent-consequent phrasing hints that this

\footnotesize
\begin{itemize}
\item \footnote{Kerman, \textit{The Beethoven Quartets}, 334.}
\item \footnote{Downes, "An Axial System of Tonality Applied to Progressive Tonality in the Works of Gustav Mahler and Nineteenth Century Antecedents", 53.}
\item \footnote{Ibid.}
\item \footnote{Ibid., 52.}
\end{itemize}
may happen, but the move to III thwarts this expectation. Yet this movement also looks forward to the finale in its harmonic and thematic material: an A chord precedes the G-sharp that ends the first section, sounding like $\flat$VI – V in C-sharp (though $\flat$ VI is not spelled as such and hence open to contention), and this prefigures the harmonic movement that bridges the sixth and seventh movements.

The sixth movement is a brief Adagio in G-sharp minor that turns to G-sharp major (the dominant of C-sharp) in its final bars, after which the finale arrives and fulfills “our expectations for a movement that single-mindedly focuses on the process of tonicisation.”\(^\text{362}\) This is where the immanent dominant arrives.

Kerman seems certain that this finale is a solution to the “problem”:

Beethoven has arranged things here so that he can strike frankly with his best weapons – themes in strong contrast and in arresting juxtaposition, exciting modulations, ‘expansive and argumentative development,’ triumphant returns, and great summary codas. Sonata form is treated without rigidity and yet (what is rare in finales) with full emphasis and amplitude. . .\(^\text{363}\)

We must attribute the success of this movement to the pacing and tonal logic of the entire Quartet. This is the heaviest movement, but does not seem unduly so as the previous non-tonicising movements – with the exception of the fugue – seem preparatory in comparison. One way which Beethoven achieves this is through his use of axial relatives both within and between movements, which effect modulation without creating preemptory tonal drama, but another is the deep harmonic and thematic integration for which Beethoven’s late period works are renowned. Additionally, the fugue remains crucial to the formal plan of this quartet: its tonal disorientation and solemnity create a palpable depth of tension

\(^{362}\) Ibid., 54.

\(^{363}\) Kerman, *The Beethoven Quartets*, 341.
that infuses the work. It seems to me that it is this tension that commentators are referring to when they describe Op. 131 in such ecstatic terms.

**Piano Sonata in B-flat major Op. 106: Hammerklavier**

In order to gain a broader perspective on late Beethoven handling of the finale problem, it is worth examining a work outside the quartet genre. The *Hammerklavier* Sonata Op. 106 is an excellent example and arguably one that loomed large in the consciousness of succeeding composers. Here again we see Beethoven shifting weight away from the first movement, and as a result the first movement sonata allegro here focuses exclusively on the subdominant and its axis members, with no structural dominant provided.\(^{364}\) However, the emphasis on the subdominant indicates an immanent subdominant. Furthermore, we might describe the Sonata as a whole as “mono-axial”: each movement is in a key of the tonic axis meaning there is no functional tonal contrast between the keys of the movements themselves. There is no transcendental dominant in this work unless one counts the introduction to IV as a discrete formal unit, and the only significant instance of dominant tonicisation is in the opening slow section to the finale. Even the finale itself does not tonicise the dominant at the background structural level.

In *The Classical Style*, Rosen suggests that these mediants and submediants create long range dissonance and thus are “true” dominants.\(^{365}\) Downes disagrees, arguing that although Beethoven is creating “long range structural dissonance, the resolution of which generates the form”, these dissonances are not true dominants:\(^{366}\) Beethoven knew the power of the dominant and simply reserved

---


it. This lack of a background dominant may be at odds with Schenker’s definition of a sonata form movement, and the tonic may be “stumbled upon rather than conclusively attained” in the recapitulation, but in a schematic sense it is still sonata form.\footnote{Ibid., 59.} This movement illustrates the extent to which axial modulation can be form-generating, without relying on a structural dominant.\footnote{For a fuller analysis of Beethoven’s Hammerklavier, refer to ibid., 56.}

The second movement, the Scherzo, does not provide a structural dominant either. The movement is short; B-flat and B-flat minor being the only significant key areas. Beethoven is reserving more weight (though not the dominant) for the third movement, an extended \textit{Adagio} slow movement. The absence of the dominant is particularly conspicuous with the bare octaves in the opening of the slow movement. We sense the possibility of tonal “activity”: yet this feeling is almost immediately thwarted and replaced with the “passivity” which we have been experiencing for the first two movements. Enhancing this is the foreground manifestations of the subdominant in the first two movements with the emphasis on B minor and B octaves. It is because we have a classical expectation of balance between dominant and subdominant that this movement seems to withhold so much: thus this “tragic reversal” possesses such emotional depth. The first two bars of the slow movement are especially evocative: A octaves – C-sharp octaves – F-sharp minor chord. Beethoven is acutely aware of our aural expectations and at once surprises and fulfils them. After spending so long in B-flat major, Tovey suggests we desire to hear A and C-sharp as a dominant (V\alpha) but instead “the F sharp minor chord utterly transforms everything. These two notes constitute one of the profoundest thoughts in all music.”\footnote{Donald Francis Tovey, \textit{A Companion to Beethoven’s Pianoforte Sonatas} (London: Oxford University Press, 1931), 238.} It is also worth noting that these two notes were one of the last things added to the score, in the final proof;\footnote{Rosen, \textit{The Classical Style}, 424.}
could be interpreted as a prefiguring of the opening octaves of the final movement which composes out F – A.

Again, this movement uses the tonic axis, though internally the keys are almost exclusively those of the subdominant axis: E-flat, B and G. Here lies another immanent subdominant, representing something close to a retracing of the development section of the first movement. As we have touched on in our discussion of Op. 127, the only notion preventing Beethoven from writing such an extended slow movement before this point was the possibility that it would become dull: however, because the background tensions remain unresolved, the length is “heavenly” (to borrow Schumann’s term).\textsuperscript{371} Downes writes:

If Beethoven had attained a structural dominant here, and Vα (A major) would suffice, the pressure to complete the background tonicisation of the work would not allow the work to dwell too long on a tonal dissonance before achieving closure . . . an adagio of this length would be intolerable.\textsuperscript{372}

This is an excellent example of axial relatives’ potential to generate monumentality, but this is as much because of the suspended animation of the tonicisation process as the axial keys themselves. Yet, crucially, the third movement leaves our desire for a structural dominant unfulfilled.\textsuperscript{373}

The slow introduction preceding the finale finally delivers the immanent structural dominant. F (V) is established at the opening, G-sharp minor at the preparation for the cadence into the Allegro (functioning as vα of Vα), and A


\textsuperscript{372} Ibid., 60.

\textsuperscript{373} This begs the question of when a dominant ceases to be necessary at all, which was to be tackled by Wagner and his followers later in the nineteenth century. It might be argued that Beethoven’s Ninth Symphony and Op. 133 String Quartet head in this direction - however, the works examined in this thesis that use axial tonality continue to use dominants (and their substitutes) as well as tonics. This may make an interesting study to another interested party, however.
(Vα) is also utilised. According to Downes, this “fulfills, in axial terms, the axiomatic requirements for the dominant axis to attain background level status, which in turn ensures the completion of the Schenkerian ‘triangle’ for the entire work.” The finale emphasises the leading-note motions that have been suppressed in the earlier movements, though only at a foreground level: the finale does not contain the immanent dominant. Downes concludes that this Sonata’s “‘heavenly length’ was only made possible by this delaying action, which in effect gives the entire work responsibility for unfolding the tonal plot in terms of background tonicisation, not the first movement only. Beethoven is not merely experimenting with third-related keys; he is re-thinking classical models, re-dramatising them, as it were, to sustain their duration and intensity.

**Cello Sonata Op. 102 No. 1 in C Major**

Some commentators consider this Sonata to be the first of Beethoven’s late period, perhaps in tandem with the Piano Sonata Op. 101 which shares some of its characteristics. Much of the discussion of the works in this chapter has centred on avoidance of the dominant, but this Sonata deflects attention from the tonic by tonal understatement and then rescues it in the final movement. In this sense the Sonata cannot be considered to be an example of progressive tonality, but shares the idea of making a key vulnerable to anothercompeting key by tonicising neither at a background level, meaning both keys battle to attain deeper level tonicisation. As Schoenberg writes, “If the key is to fluctuate, it will have to be established somewhere. But not too firmly; it should be loose enough to yield.” Both Op. 101 and 102 No. 1 have short lyrical first movements in which cadences in the tonic are undermined, followed by complete sonata form movements in a
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375 Ibid., 62.
subdominant-axis key. The following analysis outlines these tonal events. Though on paper they may seem unremarkable, the crafting of the Adagio and instability of the tonic certainly gives the effect of what I am proposing to call a proto-progressive tonal scheme in works such as this that admit a potent rival for tonicity.\textsuperscript{377}

The Sonata is considered in two parts: the first, the Andante and Allegro, and the second the Adagio, Andante (which cyclically recalls the first Andante) and the final Allegro.

\textbf{Figure 4.6: Beethoven, Cello Sonata (Op. 102), Part I}

\textit{Andante}

1 – 27  C major  I (of this movement and Sonata as a whole)

\textit{Allegro Vivace}

28 – 46  A minor  i of this movement

47 – 75  E minor  v (not V) used.

76 – 88  Modulating sequence (development): C major (V\(\beta\)) with Vivace theme; 80 – 82 F-sharp diminished (vii7/V/V\(\beta\)); 83 G diminished (vii7/V\(\alpha\)); 84 – 86 A 7 (V7/iv) ; 86 (end, briefly) F major (I\(\beta\)); 87 – 88 G-sharp diminished (vii7/i) to A minor (i, second beat of 88.)

89 – 92  B-flat major  IV\(\beta\)

93 – 97  D minor  iv  A7 chord suddenly, then D minor forte: at 97 there is a sudden shift to vii7/i and we are thrust back into the opening theme: recapitulation

98 – 106  A minor  i  At bar 106 there is a cadence into C

\textsuperscript{377} Downes, "An Axial System of Tonality Applied to Progressive Tonality in the Works of Gustav Mahler and Nineteenth Century Antecedents", 79. As Downes discusses, when Mahlerian progressive tonality occurs it is often via similar means to proto-progressive tonality, in which a weak tonic rivaled by a subdominant axis key; the progression from G to E in Mahler’s Fourth Symphony is a clear example. In proto-progressive tonality the original tonic is rescued; conversely, in true progressive tonality the subdominant axis key eventually wins out and displaces the original tonic.
107 – 114  F major – D minor  Iβ – iv  Brief touch on tonic axis before recapitulation continues

115 – 144  A minor  i  Regular recapitulation

145 – 151  D minor – B-flat major  iv – IVβ  Touch on subdominant axis

151 – 154  A minor  i  Ending cadence not particularly emphatic

**Figure 4.7: Beethoven, Cello Sonata (Op. 102), Part II**

*Adagio*

1. On G/C  V/I
2. C/F  I/IV
3. A/(V/A)  IVα / V/IVα
4. D minor – major – diminished  V/V – then diminished chain
5. Dim to G minor – C minor  vii7/v – v – i
6. C minor – A-flat major  i – iβ
7. G major – C  SOUNDS LIKE I – IV
8. G – now sounds like  V

*Tempo d’Andante*

10 – 16  C  I  (14 brief touch on D minor, but clearly in C): cyclically recalling first Andante

*Allegro Vivace*

1 – 22  C major  I  Piano and cello rhythmically misaligned
23 – 30  C – A minor  I – ivα  Semiquavers begin
31 – 57  G major  V
58  Rest
59 – 63  E-flat  Vβ  Cello and piano misaligned again
64  Rest
65 – 69  C  I  As 59 – 63. C sounds remote; perhaps due to minor third modulation
70  Rest
71 – 78  A-flat  Iβ
78 – 87  Sequence through F minor – C minor
The first Andante section is clearly in C major, although there are only two full-close cadences in the entire sonata – one at the end of the A minor section and one at the end of the finale.⁵⁷⁸ Hence, C is hardly tonicised strongly, and indeed, the A minor Allegro certainly seems the “apparent first movement”.⁵⁷⁹ Though the tonic is stated in the first movement, it is undermined by a transcendent subdominant, which is reinforced by its own immanent dominant. Yet in the second movement, when there are affirmative cadences into A minor, they are also often undermined by being placed on the third beat rather than the first. This is done to contrast with the end of the work, as Downes notes specifically in the finale: “how emphatic the three tonic chords at the conclusion of the work

⁵⁷⁹ Ibid.
are, having been given full metrical stress.”\textsuperscript{380} To summarise the movement, it falls within Beethoven’s tendency to inhibit sonata form in some way. The difference between this and the *Hammerklavier* or the Ninth Symphony is that the sonata mechanism is inhibited at a foreground rhythmic level (lacking Lockwood’s “full metrical stress”), whereas in the Ninth the sonata mechanism which is inhibited is at a foreground harmonic level.

However, the Adagio is of special significance. Lockwood notes that it “restores C major, but not in a firmly anchored way.”\textsuperscript{381} Although the basic polarity is between C and G (both major and minor are used) to our ears G is such a strong force in bar seven that the move to a C major chord sounds like I – IV in G. The return of the Andante theme after ten bars of Adagio seems almost as if the music is “starting again”, and this time with a firm sense of tonicity. This G could be described as a “miniature immanent dominant”, hinting at what will be fully substantiated in the finale.

The Allegro Vivace is a sonata form in C (with coda), with a significant misalignment between the piano accompaniment and the cello theme at several junctures, such as those at bars 63 and 69. This is only corrected in the final 13 bars, when, at bar 221, the cello and piano finally “line up”: the sense of arrival here is strong. This movement possesses the immanent dominant, but also the immanent subdominant in bars 190 – 212, echoing the transcendent subdominant in the first part.

The above models are representative of the most important formal types Beethoven employed in his late period. His preoccupation with tonality,
functionality and form is evidenced in works discussed in this chapter, and how later composers – particularly Franck – responded to such innovations is the concern of the remaining chapters. There is crossover between the models, indeed, but the effect of each is subtly different. These divergent paths demonstrate the pervasiveness of Beethoven’s influence on mid-to-late nineteenth-century composers and the difficulties in deciphering the inner workings of Beethoven’s late forms. The analyses also reveal other compositional tactics that Franck utilised. Chapter Five begins with a discussion of nineteenth-century compositional issues, followed by an analysis of two of Franck’s Symphonic Poems; Chapters Six to Nine analyse Franck’s absolute music.

Chapter Five

Issues of Nineteenth Century Composition and
Analysis of *Le chasseur maudit* and *Psyché*

Beethovian forms posed an ongoing challenge to subsequent composers. We must remember, however, that the expressive and technical landscape had also changed. Consequently, this chapter begins with a brief overview of some compositional issues pertinent to the nineteenth century: these must be examined before beginning analysis. I then analyse two of César Franck’s Symphonic Poems: *Le chasseur maudit* and *Psyché*. These Symphonic Poems are considered first because of their clear programmatic goals and potential to provide insight into how Franck might articulate active or passive tonal areas in absolute forms. Such considerations are vital before examining Franck’s non-programmatic works in the later chapters.

**Compositional Techniques and Issues**

*Phrase Structure and Nineteenth-Century Expository Techniques*

It is important to observe how the compositional and expository techniques of composers writing in the second age of the Symphony differ from those of composers writing in the first. This difference may also throw light on why composers encountered problems whilst attempting to emulate earlier works: an issue which is discussed at the beginning of Chapter Six in relation to Beethoven’s *Hammerklavier*.

Expository techniques must be considered, as they are important demonstrators of how composers handle musical material. Brahms’ string quartets are excellent examples of a technique which ensured originality without padding: developing variation. (The other technique we will examine is real sequence, which is associated with Liszt and Wagner.) However, the enrichment of the fundamental
bass is necessary for the success of these techniques, which often (in the case of these composers) necessitates the use of axial tonality. Dahlhaus notes that:

One small motive can become monotonous, however, no matter how variously the material is presented, unless is it alleviated and balanced by constant harmonic variety. The enrichment of the fundamental bass is the correlative, both technically and aesthetically, of developing variation.\textsuperscript{382}

Dahlhaus takes the ramifications for form and tonality no further, but his comments beg the question of how the term “correlative” reinforces the connection between the enrichment of the fundamental bass (and its co-requisite harmonic enrichment) and these expository techniques, which were new for nineteenth-century composers. It seems, paradoxically, that sonata form continued (and in many cases grew enormously) despite musical ideas becoming shorter with these new expository techniques.

\textit{Integration}

In the symphonies of Haydn or Mozart, a work could be created from a number of themes with material surrounding these themes of lesser value, which consists of both transitional passages and what we might call “musical padding”. Dahlhaus describes how “Both Wagner and Schoenberg complain about the mere padding to be found in Mozart’s music, even in some of his principal themes, but this is almost unavoidable when the musical form is made up of corresponding, well-balanced parts which of themselves delineate the whole movement.”\textsuperscript{383}

However, Beethoven represents a transition period where there are often motivic connections between the main material and filler: “In Beethoven, formal ideas and melodic detail come into being simultaneously: the single motive is relative to the

\textsuperscript{382} Carl Dahlhaus, \textit{Nineteenth Century Music} (Berkley: University of California, 1989), 63.
\textsuperscript{383} Ibid., 43.
whole.”[^384] This can be observed if we compare the first movement of Mozart’s 41st Jupiter Symphony with the first movement of Beethoven’s Fifth Symphony. The expositions alone are sufficiently illustrative: in the Mozart example, bars 17 and 18 are nothing more than a C major arpeggio, and bars 24 – 30, part of a bridge passage, employ a downward C major scale. If we compare this to a corresponding section in Beethoven’s Fifth, such as bars 44 – 56, we can see that although Beethoven uses an arpeggiating figure, the famous opening motive saturates the texture. This does not mean that classical compositions could not be motivically coherent; rather, simply that in Mozart the filler material was not reliant on the main thematic material. Furthermore, the scalic figure used at bars 24 – 30 in the Jupiter symphony is the same as that used in the corresponding section in the Prague Symphony. It is a useful fragment as it lends itself well to contrapuntal development, and Mozart uses it in this way in the development sections of both these symphonies. Beethoven does not conspicuously recycle themes in this regard.

From these examples we can observe the effects of the Doctrine of Originality. Ideally, musical ideas were to be self-sufficient, sustaining thematic importance through every point. Where Beethoven saw each idea as a component, in romantic composition a melodic unit would – ideally – be form-generating.[^385] This need for originality deeply affected nineteenth-century composers: the quality of their music was dependent on themes expounded at the start, as form was generated from the opening ideas. Schoenberg states that: “segments or sections which fulfil structural requirements should do so without being mere trash.”[^386] Each phrase should be embedded with meaning, as superfluous padding was deemed unacceptable. Readers may realise the irony in pairing “monumentality” with the

[^384]: Ibid., 42.
[^385]: Ibid., 41.
[^386]: Arnold Schoenberg, *Style and Idea* (London: Lowe and Brydone, 1951), 64.
Doctrine of Originality – if every component of a musical composition needs to be original, monumentality becomes even more difficult to achieve.

A comparison of Mozart and Beethoven succinctly shows the paradigm shift from thematic material being relatively unimportant to its integration being paramount. It will come as no surprise, then, that later nineteenth-century composers treated their melodic ideas differently to their predecessors. For the task of maintaining originality, or conversely eliminating padding, there emerged two expository techniques which I shall now examine: real sequence, used predominantly by Liszt and Wagner; and developing variation, used by Brahms.

**Real ‘literal’ Sequence.** The “literal” or “real” sequence used by Wagner and Liszt differs from sequence used by Classical composers. In Haydn and Beethoven, sequence is a developmental technique, part of the “working out” of a musical idea. However, real sequence is used to develop an idea which is musically complete in itself, and “would not tolerate conventional ‘rounding-off’ in a closed period.” An excellent example of real sequence can be observed in Liszt’s B minor Sonata. Three motives are stated at the opening, and through the splitting and combining of the second two motives much of the melodic material for the Sonata is generated. At bar 18, a syncopated downward flourish figure begins, which occurs three times: each time a tone higher. There is no definite key centre as the harmony consists of diminished sevenths. At bar 25, however we arrive unambiguously at E-flat major and regular rhythm ensues. This is a significant moment, highlighted by the ff marking and metric stability, especially given that E-flat major is Iα. The effect of using real sequence before the moment in E-flat major is dramatic, as the listener is jolted from a period of tonal flux to the E-flat major
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387 Dahlhaus, Nineteenth Century Music, 46.
388 Ibid.
389 The first motive, a downward scalic G – G figure, is not utilised for combinational purposes: rather, it occurs more frequently at important “hinge” points in the Sonata.
goal. Liszt seems intent on emphasising the neutral anchors of the home tonic – that is, the tonic axial relatives – and because these relatives sound functionally ambivalent, there remains the possibility of a genuine, oppositional second tonal area. As we shall see when we return to the discussion of this work, functional areas are preserved through axial modulation throughout the Sonata.

Though real sequence is employed more frequently in large scale symphonic works or music drama, and developing variation more common to chamber music, the two techniques are alternative responses to the same desire for originality. Although Brahms is most often associated with the technique of developing variation, his G minor Fantasy for piano, Op. 79, uses real sequence. The opening appears to be in a state of tonal flux, with D minor, F major and G major all touched on by way of real sequence. G minor is suggested in bars 11 – 12, but not fully expounded until the development section at bars 61 – 85,\textsuperscript{390} where the second subject group appears in the dominant, confirming the tonality. Dahlhaus asserts that this tonal flux is achieved due to sonata form being second nature to listeners in the nineteenth century, and by the employment of D minor as a second subject area, G minor itself is confirmed. It is only retrospectively that G minor is recognised as the “common denominator” of the first subject group, becoming the tonic the ear demands.\textsuperscript{391} We might suggest that axially related keys provide opportunity for modulation without dramatising the opposition of tonic and dominant too early – cadences occur in G major and B major, I and Iα respectively, and the opening of the work also features axial relatives, with the first two sequential occurrences beginning in E-flat major and G major, Iβ and I respectively. These are but two works which suggest that both Liszt and Brahms were aware of the potential of axial modulation in effecting functional neutrality, allowing a truly oppositional tonicising second tonal area to emerge.

\textsuperscript{390} Dahlhaus, Nineteenth Century Music, 70.
\textsuperscript{391} Ibid., 71.
Developing Variation. In Style and Idea, Schoenberg proclaims to be Brahms a “great progressive”, adding that this may seem “contestable to an incarnate ‘old-Wagnerian’ . . . [as they considered] themselves entitled to look with contempt at Brahms, the classicist, the academician.”\textsuperscript{392} Schoenberg is drawing on the popularly held idea that Brahms was part of a “conservative” symphonic school, with Liszt and Wagner constituting the “new German” school. However, Schoenberg asserts that this paints an inaccurate picture of Brahms, noting that: “there was as much organisational order, if not pedantry in Wagner as there was daring courage, if not even bizarre fantasy in Brahms.”\textsuperscript{393} In spite of the partisan differences that seemed to exist between these composers it is easy to overlook that Brahms faced the same problem as Liszt and Wagner: that of sustaining form and originality simultaneously.\textsuperscript{394} However, the solution Brahms most often sought was developing variation. Like real sequence, developing variation is an expository procedure, where elaboration of a thematic idea is the primary formal principle.\textsuperscript{395} Schoenberg states that: “the most important capacity of a composer is to cast a glance into the most remote future of his themes or motives.”\textsuperscript{396} In other words, a composer must know the potential and direction of his theme as he begins composing, as this will affect the composition from the outset. For Brahms’ developing variation technique, this potential was both rhythmic and melodic. However, any rhythmic potential must be distinguished from mere rhythmic variation: Schoenberg observes that whilst Schubert and Schumann frequently varied themes melodically but retained rhythmic similarity, Brahms “repeated phrases, motives and other structural ingredients of themes only in varied

\textsuperscript{392} Schoenberg, Style and Idea, 56.
\textsuperscript{393} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{394} Dahlhaus, Nineteenth Century Music, 47.
\textsuperscript{395} Ibid., 49.
\textsuperscript{396} Schoenberg, Style and Idea, 80.
forms.” Furthermore, developing variation in both a melodic and rhythmic sense should not be confused with thematic transformation (discussed in Chapter One): a longer-range unifying device more akin to re-birth than this variation technique which often introduces its variant after a statement of the theme. Figure 5.1 is an example of developing variation.

Figure 5.1: Brahms, Symphony No. 2/iii (Op. 73), bars 1 – 14

Developing variation is more closely related to a linkage technique, whereas thematic transformation usually preserves rhythmic integrity in terms of anacrustic or thetic events within the theme, whilst varying other parameters.

Dahlhaus examines Brahms’ developing variation closely in the G minor Piano Quartet Op. 25. The first bar (D – B-flat – F-sharp – G) provides material for the first eight bars through transposition and free inversion. The second part, built on a descending second, is repeated sequentially and imitatively, and altered rhythmically. Dahlhaus notes that: “Compositional economy, the building of musical interest out of minimal capital, was taken to extremes by Brahms.” However, when developmental techniques are employed in the exposition, sonata form is altered by necessity. Dahlhaus observes how:

Sonata form takes on a different meaning from the one it originally had when motivic development, the elaboration of thematic ideas, becomes the
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397 Ibid., 185.
398 Dahlhaus, Nineteenth Century Music, 63.
primary structural principle, in place of the pattern of key relationships and the construction of symmetrical groups.\textsuperscript{399}

As mentioned earlier, for Dahlhaus the enrichment of the fundamental bass is the correlative of developing variation. As Brahms had expanded the number of degrees in regular use, this endangered regular periodic structure at it existed in 1800.\textsuperscript{400} At this time, harmonic foundations were simple models such as I – V – V – I, as we see in principal themes of Mozart’s \textit{Jupiter} Symphony, for example. Dahlhaus argues that periodic structure and harmonic enrichment can coexist, but also notes “the procedure is self-defeating as long as the technical and aesthetic criterion is the rule that development of all the elements of the composition should be analogous.”\textsuperscript{401} Dahlhaus asserts that Brahms averts this by employing Bach’s technique of composing tripartite groups which evolve from an initial phrase through harmonically enriched developmental passages, rather than being tied down to a cadential structure. However, Dahlhaus concludes by asserting: “this is not the restoration of something that belongs to the past; it is a derivation or an analogy made under fundamentally different historical conditions.”\textsuperscript{402} We must ensure, then, that when examining instances of developing variation, its effect on structure is also considered.

As a brief example from another genre, Brahms’ second Piano Concerto illustrates how harmonic enrichment can allow modulation in traditionally mono-tonal areas whilst harnessing the axial systems’ functional neutrality to reinforce traditional tonic/dominant opposition.\textsuperscript{403} The problem concerto composers faced – and this was as for Mozart as for Brahms – was how to provide harmonic interest in the opening orchestral ritornello, as modulation is not an option before the soloist

\textsuperscript{399} Ibid., 61.
\textsuperscript{400} Ibid., 63.
\textsuperscript{401} Ibid., 62.
\textsuperscript{402} Ibid., 64.
\textsuperscript{403} Mozart uses the tonic minor briefly in his Piano Concerto K. 467, from bar 110.
enters at the second ritornello lest the music become tautological. Rosen articulates this concept:

The first ritornello continued, as before, to begin and end in the tonic . . . but as the first ritornello expanded to symphonic length, casting all of its themes and motives in the tonic was not a simple matter . . . it was . . . difficult to handle a succession of themes all in the same key without the danger of monotony. 404

In this Concerto, Brahms maintains functional neutrality and averts this “monotony” in the first ritornello by use of D minor, the iα relative to the tonic B flat major, effectively expanding the tonic area. This ritornello occurs from bars 48 and continues until the piano re-entry. 405 This might be considered a Schubertian solution. Downes writes that: “For Schubert, the tonal interval of the major third clearly had the capacity for what could almost be called passive modulation. This property was exploited to increase the breadth and scale of some of his later sonata-form works, without jeopardising the set functions of the various structural sections.” 406 This major-third modulation allowed enrichment without wrecking sonata opposition, and it is just as applicable to the concerto as it is to other genres.

Liszt and Brahms seem to be using axial systems for similar reasons. The works discussed above show how composers can create harmonic goals which are non-tonicising or passive chromatic incursions produced from expository techniques. Such incursions can be used in conjunction with real sequence as well as developing variation. However, these goals do not disrupt the fundamental tonal opposition of sonata form. How such incursions might be adapted to programmatic ends is considered later in this chapter.

Double-tonic complexes

405 The first piano concerto in D minor also incorporates tonic axial relatives.
As the notion of proto-progressive tonality is significant to this thesis, it is pertinent to also examine a correlative: double-tonic complexes. Related to the idea of progressive tonality (or proto-progressive tonality as discussed in the previous chapter), Deborah Stein describes double-tonic complexes as possessing: “a complex formal design in which the traditional common-practice polarity of two closely related harmonies is replaced by a tension between two opposing and remotely related tonalities.”\textsuperscript{407} The reader can see how this idea can be easily related to the concept of progressive (or proto-progressive) tonality: two tonalities vie for structural importance within a work. Yet double-tonic complexes are not necessarily so teleological. Bribitzer-Stull states that:

While directional [similar concept to progressive] tonality comprises the transformation of tonic function from one tonic chord (key) to another across the span of a piece, the two tonic keys of a double-tonic complex are not simply its opening and closing tonal centres: rather, they are the dual harmonic poles between which the music oscillates, at one point suggesting one key, and on another occasion the other.\textsuperscript{408}

This may well be a relevant concept when looking at some of Franck’s works: particularly Psyché, with its evocations of a dream-like state and remote modulations. In this case, a double-tonic complex also possesses potential to articulate a programme – for instance, a shift from sleeping to waking.

Having examined some important compositional issues, let us now consider the implications they may have on Franck’s works, beginning with analysis of two Symphonic Poems.

\textbf{Franck’s Symphonic Poems}

Franck’s Symphonic Poems may seem an unusual analytical choice given that most of this thesis is concerned with absolute music. However, Franck – like Brahms and

\textsuperscript{407} Matthew Bribitzer-Stull, "The End of Die Feen and Wagner’s Beginnings: Multiple Approaches to an Early Example of Double-Tonic Complex, Associative Theme and Wagnerian Form," \textit{Music Analysis} 25, no. 3 (2006): 324.

\textsuperscript{408} Ibid.
others – was clearly interested in more than one compositional method, an interest demonstrated by his use of different formal models in works analyzed later. Whilst some of Franck’s absolute forms relate strongly to those of late Beethoven, these are novel; his approach to form in these Symphonic Poems is mediated by the dramatic demands of the chosen programmes. How Franck manipulates axial tonality to these ends may inform our analysis of his absolute works.

Franck’s Le chasseur maudit shares characteristics with Liszt’s B minor sonata: not the double function aspect, but the division of the work into sections which perform different functions. (The same may be said of a number of Symphonic Poems of Liszt, Franck and others.) Le chasseur maudit is particularly interesting, however, considering the relationships between subject matter and the notions of activity and inactivity. This designation may be applicable to immanent and transcendent terms. Psyché, written between 1887 and 1888, is quite a different specimen, instead looking forward to the impressionist techniques of Debussy. This too relates to the programme put forward by the subject matter, and is one of Franck’s most harmonically innovative works.

**Le chasseur maudit**

*Le chasseur maudit* was composed in 1882 and first performed March 1883. It is based on a ballad by Bürger, and:

narrates the terrifying adventure that befell a certain Rhenish count, who, one Sunday morning, defying the holiness of the day, dashed forth upon a fantastic hunting expedition while all the bells and the chanting of the church choirs were sounding on every side. A menacing voice sounded a warning: ‘Sacrilege will lead

eternally to the fires of hell.’ Frightened by its tones, he races on even more quickly, pursued by a horde of devils.\textsuperscript{410}

A horn call begins the Symphonic Poem, before a gentle theme that represents the singing of the church choirs. The horn call then returns and is expanded to represent the riding of the hunters. This theme occurs many times, which I have represented as RoH in the analysis and thereafter. The analysis here demonstrates how axial tonality can be manipulated for dramatic effect.

\textbf{Figure 5.2: Franck, \textit{Le chasseur maudit}}

G major/minor  
\textit{Andantino quasi allegretto}

\begin{align*}
1 – 76 & \quad G \quad I \quad \text{(Though sounds like IV): horn call, Church theme} \\
(\text{Key change: G minor})

\textit{L’istesso Tempo}

77 – 92 & \quad G minor \quad i \quad ‘Announcement’ in horn; riding of the hunters \\
\textit{Poco piu animato}

93 – 128 & \quad G minor \quad i \quad \text{Sequence in minor thirds. RoH at bar 114.} \\
129 – 139 & \quad F minor - V/B minor \quad \text{WT related – V/α} \\
140 – 191 & \quad B minor \quad \text{RoH theme, sequential movement} \\
192 – 202 & \quad G \quad I \quad \text{Sequential movement by thirds} \\
(\text{Key change: E-flat})

203 – 206 & \quad E-flat \quad \text{Based on RoH theme} \\
207 – 210 & \quad \text{Sequence} \\
211 – 214 & \quad F major \quad \text{RoH theme} \\
215 – 222 & \quad \text{Sequence, preparing for G minor} \\
(\text{Key change: G minor})

\textit{Un Poco piu animato}

223 – 245 & \quad G minor \quad i \quad \text{RoH theme, extended, triple forte} \\
\textit{Poco meno vivo}

246 – 272 & \quad \text{Half-diminished chords on C-sharp and F-sharp (262); RoH theme, new feel}

\textsuperscript{410} \textit{Léon Vallas, \textit{César Franck}, (George G. Harrap & Co. Ltd., 1951), 176.}
(Key change: B minor)

*Malto lento*

273 – 282  B minor  iα  ‘Curse section’ begins
283 – 292  D minor  v  As 273 – 282, but a minor third
293 – 311  Semitonal sequential movement

*Più animato*

312 – 327  More sequential movement

*Un poco piu animato*

328 – 335  Sequence, preparation for G minor

(Key change: G minor)

336 – 345  G minor  i  Climax on G diminished – A-flat
            German 6th – A ½ diminished chords
346 – 368  G minor  i  Whole RoH theme, variants, more V
369 – 386  A minor  WT related – v/V As above, then V/G at 387
387 – 392  On D minor  v/i  Triplet figure
393 – 397  On B minor 7  iα7
398 – 405  B-flat minor  vβ

*Poco piu Allegro*

406 – 425  Sequential patterns from RoH in F-sharp minor heading to G

*Quasi presto*

426 – 449  G minor  i
450 – 453  G minor – F minor  i – WT related
454 – 510  Dominant preparation for i, fortissimo
510 – 542  G minor  i  RoH theme eventually extinguished.

Clearly, Franck is using axial relationships (among other techniques) to generate drama. More specifically though, it seems that particular types of harmonic movement, through giving an impression of action or inaction, help convey the story: action and inaction are virtually personified through harmony.

The opening horn call suggests D, and hence G sounds like the subdominant when it arrives. This generates tension, as from bar 13 there is opposition between G and D, with D (V7) over a G pedal point alternating with an A minor7 chord. This seems
programmatically linked to inaction; a musical embodiment of contemplation that should be Sunday worship. We know that the protagonist does not subscribe to this contemplation, so how this will play out musically remains to be seen. The following section is largely in the tonic axis. At bar 37: the church choirs theme appears in the celli. E-flats and B-flats are used in the texture, over a G pedal, and the music builds to a gentle climax at bar 61. The cadences are largely plagal.

Bar 77 (L’istesso Tempo) presents an “announcement” from the horn, and the tonality shifts to G minor. This is the “riding of the hunters” theme (RoH). Though there is a sense of foreboding from the mode and driving rhythm, voice-leading remains plagal, and harmonies alternate between G major and minor. Programmatically, the shift of tonality and the introduction of the RoH theme might be seen to represent the Count defying the “holiness of the day”, heading into the woods to hunt instead. Between bars 77 and 92 the music seems as though it is struggling to gain impetus, as there are four fermatas between these bars. However, these fermatas cease at the Poco piu animato at 93. Simultaneous use of A-flats and F-sharps resolving like German sixths are rife: these chords alternate with G minor, eventually becoming a “proper” German sixth of C minor at bar 100. Despite this, C minor remains unconfirmed, and G minor reasserts itself in the next section. We thus feel a sense of stasis in the music.

At bar 105, the first sequence begins on minor thirds: F-sharp – A – C then D, which eventually suggests the dominant of G minor; unsuccessful in its sequential modulation effort. There is a G minor arrival with tutti forces at bar 114, using the RoH theme; this is restated in B-flat major in bar 118. This minor third relationship is emphasised again between bars 125 – 127. Although the thematic material is bombastic, with a driving rhythm, the music does not harmonically progress anywhere. I suggest this is because the modulations have been based around minor thirds: it may sound as though we have been moving – indeed, the music has – but
as minor thirds equally divide the octave, if the music continues to modulate in this way it may simply end up back where it started, and the music actually returns to the tonic. So, despite an attempt to establish a second tonal area, the music has “failed”, and we can ascertain programmatic indications from this: Franck seems to be indicating that effort in an inappropriate endeavour is futile. From bar 129 the music remains in the tonic axis, by a move first to F minor (emphatically – a whole tone relative to G minor), then B minor – iα – at bar 139.

Franck emphasises the Neapolitan of B minor (spelled as German sixth), which then becomes an actual German sixth of E minor, resolving in bar 163. E minor’s Neapolitan then appears, but this time it resolves to C major (B minor’s Neapolitan) at bar 167. More sequential material follows using minor thirds, beginning on A-sharp and terminating on the dominant of B minor, before another B minor arrival at bar 177. The return of the RoH theme then brings a D major restatement after the B minor, finally transitioning back at bar 190; this parallels the G minor / B-flat relationship of the initial statement of the main theme.

It seems that Franck is using a type of double exposition, where the initial expository material is repeated almost exactly in another key. Franck also uses this technique in his Symphony, where the exposition plays the initial material in both D minor (i) and F minor (Vβ). In Le chasseur maudit, however, Franck uses two tonic axis keys, effectively making the repeat less disruptive and more inactive (the Symphony in D minor is examined more closely in Chapter Eight). Though it may seem from an initial glance that this technique is related to the problematising of the tonic as in Beethoven’s Op. 102 No. 1, the effect here does not actually undermine the tonic: rather, it reinforces the idea of activity without gain. Shakespeare’s Macbeth put it well: “it is a tale / Told by an idiot, full of sound and fury, / Signifying nothing.”

---

411 Shakespeare. MacBeth, Act V Sc. V.
Unsurprisingly, we end up back in G major via B as a pivot note at bar 191, where there is a localised sequence through minor thirds, though this time the music resolves into A minor at bar 199. At bar 203, however, there is a sudden shift through A major and B-flat major and we are thrust into E-flat major, the only tonic axis key to not be emphasized so far. The thematic material is still based around the RoH theme, and as such seems immensely repetitive. So, from the material thus far, we can ascertain that the main key relations are axial: G-B-E-flat. These key relations (and the localised minor third sequences) reinforce the idea that the huntsman is running around in circles – there is a sense of great exertion in the transitional sections – and achieving nothing. One more step and he will be back at square one, and sure enough, at bar 223 the music returns to G minor, the tonic. Overall, the music seems stuck in the tonic axis.

From what we have observed so far, passive axial modulation is here stigmatised as negative and pointless. There are other factors contributing to the perceived “uselessness” – tempo, figuration, and the monotonous repetition of the RoH theme, and these combine with a tonality unable to achieve itself in a sonata sense. On this basis, it would be logical to assume that Franck would carry the technique over into his absolute works, to assert inactivity of some sort in the way his contemporaries and forebears did: Beethoven, Schubert, Liszt, Brahms and others.

At bar 246 we reach the “curse” section. There is indeed a new feel to the music, with rustling strings and diminished chords. By bar 273, we begin to sense the severity of the “curse”: the music begins in B minor, but aggressive minor third and other non-whole-tone modulations begin, through D minor, F minor, E minor and E-flat major. Franck often instigates modulation by introducing the German sixth of a key and then reinterpreting it. This is one of Franck’s favourite devices, both in this work and others. The music eventually makes its way to F-sharp minor (Vα) at bar 310. This contrasts markedly with the stuck-in-the-tonic-axis activity up to now, but
this music represents the marshalling of the spirit forces that will doom the hunter to hell. His actions (hunting) achieve nothing as he is stuck in the tonic axis of G-B-E-flat, but the actions of the spirit forces will have profound consequences. It is a marvellous and perfectly logical application of tonal forces to depict the impotent hunter and the far from impotent demons.

Now a new section begins: *Piu animato*. It is a harmonically complex section with significant wholetone modulation: sinister murmurings in the strings move through F-sharp minor, D major, and G-sharp major. Then the pattern begins again in A minor and shifts through F major, then B major. The music then moves through C minor, D minor, and E minor (all of these with added sixths) then G (V of C). The climax of the section (and arguably the work as a whole) is the fortissimo tutti at bar 336, hammering G diminished, A-flat German sixth type and A half diminished chords with a driving dotted rhythm. At bar 340 this German sixth type chord resolves onto E-flat with G in the bass, before another fortissimo chord on E-flat, G and B natural: the augmented triad on tonic axis. This is a logical manifestation of whole-tonality given the relationships that precede it. At bar 344 we have a chromatic resolution into G minor, using the dotted part of the RoH theme. This time, however, the dominant is more emphatic: it articulates G minor in the fourth bar of the phrase for the first time in the life of this motive. Furthermore, Franck extends the motive of a rising third to include a perfect fourth as well as its usual minor and major thirds, such as bars 358 – 360. The snippet of the RoH theme recurs in A minor at bar 369, and we get back to V/ G at bar 386, before an unexpected twist in the form of a B minor7 chord jolts us in bar 393.

Then, at the *Poco Piu allegro* at bar 406, the music moves into F-sharp minor, vα. This leads into a sequence beginning at bar 410, in which the bass moves downward in wholetone steps then jumps a sixth to begin again. Hence the second instance begins on A in bar 414, and the third on C in bar 418. The third time, however, the
chromatic steps between C – B – B-flat are emphasised and eventually become B-flat – A – A-flat in bar 425. This bar ends with a diminished seventh on A-flat, which resolves into G minor, becoming the first bar of the *Quasi presto*. The *Quasi Presto* seems to be an elaboration on gains greater emphasis with E-flat-D and B-flat-A in the bass.

At bar 454 we return to B – unsurprising – but it is spelled as C-flat major. Sequential motion follows, before the critical culmination of the Symphonic Poem: at bar 478 there is alternation between V and German sixth chords, with different rhythmic emphasis each time. We are reminded of the important role rhythm plays in any type of resolution. This continues until we reach a D pedal at bar 506. This resolves as expected into G at bar 510, although the flat sixth and sharpened seventh scale degrees remain in the texture. There is then a gradual decrescendo toward the end before ending with a fortissimo chord in G minor.

*Le chasseur maudit* uses many of Franck’s familiar harmonic twists. The “wrong” direction around the cycle of fifths (V – ii) occurs several times before it is “corrected” near the end of the Symphonic Poem. The first half of the work uses mainly tonic and subdominant axis keys with largely plagal voice-leading (particularly in the 9/8 RoH theme). Franck also uses a double exposition, as the RoH material is repeated almost exactly in B minor. Toward the end of the work, however, more dominant axis keys are employed as well as dominant voice-leading, introduced in the “curse” section. There is a great deal of foreground modulation, but this usually does not stray far from the tonic. Many of the transitory sections seem repetitive, and, like many of Franck’s works, fermatas cause a great deal of stopping and starting. (This aspect of the Symphony has been criticised: however, this may work better in a Symphonic Poem in reference to a programme.) Significant
emphasis also occurs on♭VI both as a key area, scale degree and chord, often as a German sixth.

The most important aspect to note, however, is Franck’s use of harmonic areas to illustrate the content of the Symphonic Poem. Axially related keys are used to illustrate and dramatise goal-lessness, and their use emphasises the inevitability of the hunter’s fate – he cannot escape as he is stuck in the tonic axis. Minor third and non-wholetone modulations dramatise action, forcing the hunter to hell, and reinforcing the “active” nature of such relationships and the inevitable triumph of the spirit forces.

However, this only partially explains the musical picture. Though the potential impotence of the hunter can be appreciated, it seems that Franck imposes his own moral perspective on the work, by way of major-third modulation. Franck imposes the major-third modulation, but the hunter does not think this way: hence, the huntsman lacks agency, undermining the overall drama of Le chasseur maudit. We might consider Franck an “intrusive narrator”, in that he not only illustrates the narrative musically, but also “freely comments on his characters, evaluating their actions and motives and expressing his views about human life in general.”\(^{412}\) This is not a criticism of moral character – rather an observation that by allowing his judgement to affect his compositional technique, Franck extinguishes the tonal drama; the huntsman’s agency is not humanised, the formal result being randomly linear. The potential alternative would have been an omniscient narrator, such as Schubert’s Erlking – Schubert does not judge, he only observes. Franck’s intrusion causes some similar issues in his Symphonic Poem Psyché, which will now be considered.

Psyché

Franck’s original Symphonic Poem was in three sections and included chorus. The version I have taken for analysis is the Symphonic Suite Franck wrote based on the original, as a survey of recordings shows that excerpts from this are more frequently recorded and performed than the work in its entirety with chorus.

A short synopsis helps impart the moods Franck may have wished to convey in the music. Psyché, is a beautiful girl; so beautiful that people forget about the goddess Venus. Venus becomes angry and plots to ruin Psyché, so instructs Cupid, her son, to pierce Psyché with his arrow and make her fall in love with the most hideous man alive. However, when Cupid sees how beautiful Psyché is, he pierces himself with the arrow instead. Cupid and Psyché marry without Psyché ever seeing Cupid. When Psyché’s sisters visit her, they surmise that she has never seen her husband, and convince her to sneak a look at him. Conflicted, Psyché does so, and sees the beautiful Cupid lying beside her. She weeps for her lack of faith. Cupid awakes and deserts her, as love cannot live where there is no trust. Cupid returns to Venus, who again decides to enact revenge on Psyché. She goes to Venus for help, and Venus sets her impossible tasks to complete if she wants to see Cupid again. Against all odds, Psyché completes all the tasks, the last of which is to go to the underworld and collect some of Persephone’s beauty in a box. Psyché does so, but on her journey to return to Venus, she becomes curious, opens the box, and immediately falls asleep. Cupid finds her sleeping, and takes her to Zeus to request her immortality. Zeus grants this, and Cupid and Psyche are married.

The original three parts were as follows: one, “Sommeil de Psyché”, (“Psyche Asleep”); “Psyché enlevée par les zephyrs” (“Psyché awakened by the breezes”); two, “Les Jardins d’Eros” (“The Garden of Cupid”); [with chorus], “Psyché et Eros”

---

(“Cupid and Psyche”), a love duet; and three, “Le Châtiment (souffrances et plaints de Psyché)” (“Punishment: Psyche’s sufferings and griefs”) a tragic episode, then finally; “Apotéose” (“The Apotheosis”) representing the forgiveness of Eros. The suite is entirely instrumental: Sommeil de Psyché; Psyché enlevée par les Zéphirs; Les jardins d’Eros; Psyché et Eros. Whilst it would be inappropriate to take the four sketches as a teleological story, we might consider the individual moods evoked by particular titles and what Franck would have wanted to convey.

This movement is titled “Psyché asleep”.

Figure 5.3: Franck, Sommeil De Psyché (Sketch 1)

B major

*Lento*

1 – 9  B major – minor  I – i  #1 in Clarinet
10 – 17  D major – minor  Vβ - vβ  #1 Oboe and Flute
18 – 21  F-sharp minor  v  [18: Reh. A]
22 – 31  B major/ G-sharp minor I & ivα
26 – 29: G-sharp 1st inversion – B / E 1st inversion – G# / A# ½ dim to G# min (x2)
32 – 39  B major  I  [36: Reh. B]
40 – 46  B major/ G-sharp minor I – ivα
47 – 51  G-sharp minor  ivα
52 – 53  Preparation for A-flat – A-sharp ½ dim and C-sharp major
61 – 64  C-sharp major/ minor  WT to tonic axis
65 – 66  Transition (as bars 8 – 9 and elsewhere, melody emphasising 7th)
67 – 70  E-flat major  WT to tonic axis
71 – 72  Transition (as 65 – 66)  [71: Reh. E]
73 – 80  F minor, then transition WT to tonic axis
Diminished 7th (1/2) built on G, almost sounds like German sixth of B
81 – 84  V/B, then ambiguous

---

414 Vallas, César Franck, 207.
G-sharp makes a strong claim for tonicity, but B major is both the opening and closing key. However, this sketch feels tonally flat, and given its title – “Psyché asleep” – this seems entirely natural. In fact, *Psyché* is one of Franck’s stronger orchestral works because Franck’s harmonic procedures suit the text entirely, and by this point in his career (*Psyché* was composed between 1887 and 1888) he was beginning to handle orchestration in a more sophisticated manner. Franck’s picture of Psyché is a very naïve one, evidenced by the relative simplicity of the motif between Reh. A+14 – 17. Here, Cohn might argue that tonality is on the verge of being annihilated: a vestige of the tone-row (discussed in Chapter Two) appears in Reh. F+5 – 6, with weak harmonic movement, which places new importance on the foreground.

Whilst other works by Franck use axial tonality at a middle or background level, this work uses it in the foreground. This is not radically new – Franck does use such gestures in other works – but here the foreground axial gestures are used much more frequently and saturate the texture. The opening accompaniment, for example, uses axial relatives as foreground harmonies: B major to G major in the string figure, bars 4 – 5. Although the largely triadic harmony provides a sense of key, there is actually little functional harmony: chordal movement is by major and minor third (such as bars 8 – 9, which move from B major to D major, and bars 12 – 13 which move from D major – B-flat major) with sevenths and ninths often present; this harmonic movement accompanies a melody rising through a tonic triad and its major seventh. The gentle tempo and ambiguity of time signature (between 3/4 and
6/8) slow the harmonic rhythm, so that directional harmony would be difficult to sense regardless. This movement through a major seventh chord occurs again between Reh. A-2 – 1, this time from D major – F-sharp minor (a flat, axial shift). We might also note that when voices are not moving triadically, they are usually only moving by semitone or tone; this contributes to the feeling of contracting and retracting. The movement’s first strong cadential point occurs at Reh. B-4: a perfect cadence into B major.

Because of the fluidity of key and the closeness of minor keys to their relative major, the emphasis on G-sharp is not surprising – though we should note that it might also function as IVα. After Reh. B-4 the harmony becomes more functional: a circle of fifths movement precedes a cadence into G-sharp at Reh. B+11, approached by an augmented cadence on Iα encompassing all the pitches of the tonic axis. This arrival coincides with tutti forces at Reh. C, and G-sharp turns enharmonically to A-flat. However, the harmonic movement in the following bars (F minor and E at C+1 – 2 respectively) means that when we hear G-sharp only four bars after the tutti announcement of Reh. C, it sounds foreign. G-sharp then acts as V/ C-sharp, paired with the first theme. At Reh. D+6 the major seventh melodic idea returns, inciting a harmonic shift through E-major to F and E-flat (enharmonically Iα), confirmed with a perfect cadence. Another movement through the major seventh melody in that key begins at Reh. E.

Between Reh. E+2 and E+9 there is a transitional period, largely using the syncopated melodic material and keys wholetone related to the tonic. We sense a strong arrival in the dominant at bar 81 (F-sharp), but by Reh. E+14 we are back in G-sharp minor with the major seventh theme. A foreground dominant at Reh. F-5 tonicises an arrival of B at Reh. F-4, but again, four bars later, we are back in G-sharp minor, with a tutti arrival at Reh. F+4. However, this is but part of a shift back to B, the harmony being G-sharp minor (second inversion, then root position) – G minor –
B major. We then remain in this key for the rest of the movement, which ends very gently.

It is interesting to compare the harmonic movement here with that of *Le chasseur maudit*. In *Psyché*, the overall feeling is a luxurious one; of space and of tonal flatness. Modulation occurs, to be sure, but usually either to tonic and subdominant axis members, also encompassing the relative minor. Melodic material is largely triadic; other voices move predominantly by step. This can easily be linked to the idea of sleep; the gentle musical stasis underlines the subject matter and feels entirely appropriate. *Psyché* is not “active” – very much the opposite – and the musical materials reflect this notion. By comparison, the protagonist in *Le chasseur maudit* is highly active and very much in control; whether his decisions are moral or not, he decides his destiny, and his activity is reinforced by the active nature of the harmony in the Symphonic Poem. These works contrast very effectively.

We turn now to the second sketch: “Psyché Enlevée par les Zéphirs”. Though Franck provides no key signature here, this work is analysed in G major, the key of the opening section. G is equivocal, however, and the music only asserts itself with the arrival of C major, and continues to modulate until the end of the movement.

**Figure 5.4: Franck, Psyché Enlevée par les Zéphirs (Sketch 2)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Begins in G major</th>
<th>Allegro vivo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 – 30</td>
<td>G major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39 – 54</td>
<td>C major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 – 58</td>
<td>Transition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59 – 68</td>
<td>E-flat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69 – 79</td>
<td>A-flat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80 – 99</td>
<td>Transition</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This movement is based on *Les Eolides*, a Symphonic Poem that Franck composed between 1875 and 1876. However, this sketch is much shorter than the original, aiming only to capture something of the atmosphere of “Psyché awakened by the breezes”.\(^{415}\) This version uses the augmented triad a great deal, which diverts importance away from the tonality and onto other features, such as the melodic material and orchestration. The music begins on open Bs, which become a G major chord. Then a specific harmonic movement enters which deserves discussion, as it is one of the distinguishing features of this movement.

**Figure 5.5: Franck, Psyché Enlevée par les Zéphirs (Sketch 2) bars 9 – 10**

This harmonic cell (arguably the most memorable in the movement) uses the flat-sixth and sharp-fourth scale degrees. This chord is related to the German sixth because it contains these tones (though the third of the initial triad is major and hence not an actual German sixth); alternatively it might be described as an augmented triad with an additional sharpened fourth. It possesses a similar function to that of the German sixth though; both tones require resolution, and indeed the tones move in this way. Here, Franck uses a German sixth type chord in a way that differs from the traditional use; this is also discussed in Chapter Nine regarding the first movement of Franck’s Violin Sonata.

---

Triplet flourishes in flute and clarinet – based around the augmented triad G – B – D-sharp – canter back and forth. Moving through D9 – F9 – A♭9 (active minor third as in *Le chasseur maudit*) our first strong sense of key is C major at bar 39. However, A-flats are included here, as the above notated harmonic cell is utilised, but based around a C major triad. *Poco piu lento* shifts the tempo suddenly at bar 59, and from here to bar 79 the music is exactly reminiscent of bars 488 – 507 in *Les Eolides*, transposed a semitone higher (this section of *Les Eolides* modulates from A – D).

Following this there is a frenzied transition with no real key center made up of augmented, diminished and chromatic movement. Melodic snippets suggest D and E minor, but not strongly, before an A-flat7 chord gently bursts out of the texture at Reh. M-4. This sounds like a dominant, and resolves at Reh. M+4 to D-flat major. The rising seventh melodic idea from the first movement returns at Reh. M+12 – *molto piu lento* – and the slow *Les Eolides* theme ends the movement in D-flat.

One does not have to be familiar with *Les Eolides* to appreciate the breeze-like quality of the melodic material here. Predominantly built around augmented triads, with rising and falling triplet figuration ebbing and flowing, this sketch is one of Franck’s most pictorial compositions. The timbral and rhythmic shifts, combined with the integration of the theme from the first movement, suggest that Psyché is indeed awakening. This is a genuinely progressively tonal work; possibly employed to illustrate the shift from unconscious to conscious.

**Figure 5.6: Franck, Les Jardins D'éros (Sketch 3)**

Key interpreted as C major (common denominator and end goal)

*Poco animato*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bars</th>
<th>Key</th>
<th>Harmony</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 – 10</td>
<td>D-flat major</td>
<td>IVβ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 – 20</td>
<td>On E-flat – A-flat – shift to A7</td>
<td>V/Ⅰβ – iv/Iα</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
33 – 36 B7 – prep for E, then away V/Iα
45 – 56 F-sharp major WT 1 2nd theme [49: Reh. C]
57 – 60 A major IVα
61 – 66 C major, then transition via B major I via Vα
67 – 70 E-flat major V/β [67: Reh. D]
71 – 74 C major I

Un peu plus large
75 – 84 C major I
85 – 90 A minor ivα
101 – 107 Prep for C – Ger6th of A-flat; G with 7th I axis
117 – 121 Trans: chromatic bass-line, dim7ths inferred in texture. C arrives but no V in preparation
122 – 140 C major I

This movement moves more swiftly than the previous two, and begins on D-flat in first inversion. Shifts from major to minor occur frequently, and added sixths used in upper woodwind parts colour the key without inferring ambiguity. We reach the main theme at Reh. A by a plagal cadence from A into E – however, immediately prior to the A7 chord the harmony is closer to A-flat, so this is more of an axial shift than it first seems. The main theme uses regular four-bar phrases and mirrors the harmonic movement associated with the melodic idea that comprised a seventh from the first movement, moving from E-major to G-sharp minor. The pattern then repeats, with the first four bars in G-sharp minor, before moving to what seems to spell B minor. However, because of the sevenths and ninths in the melody, this tonality could be interpreted as B minor with added sevenths and ninths or as D major with added sevenths and sixths. Regardless, the music then shifts to G-sharp major and moves through the cycle of fifths to reach F-sharp major at bar 45. This is paired with a new theme: a figure in falling fourths outlining a minor seventh triad
in the relative minor of the given key (for example, D-sharp minor in F-sharp major at Reh. C-4). With the perfect cadence into F-sharp, the music feels very settled.

At Reh. C+4 a theme begins in the violins that is reminiscent of Les Eolides in that it supports semitonal movement in the outer voices.

Figure 5.7: Franck, Le Jardins D’éros (Sketch 3), reh. C+4 – 7

It might be argued that this movement reverses the previous one – here, D-flat gives way to C – and Franck’s progressive scheme represent a “composing out” of the motive from Reh. C+4, together with its relative that began the movement with the contracting motion. This is unsettling, though, and this new material begins modulating through minor-third related keys: beginning in F-sharp, we move through A and C to reach E-flat at Reh. D; then back in the other direction to C before tutti forces re-articulate C’s arrival at Reh. D+8 using the material that opened this movement. A final minor third modulation to A occurs at Reh. D+18. Then, from Reh. E, an axial sweep begins through the dominants of C, E and A-flat, using an altered version of the four-bar phrase theme. A-flat then becomes bVI of C, where we end up at Reh. F-2. From this point on the movement becomes much flatter as the main type of movement is axial. F is touched on briefly, before the music returns to C major to end the movement: the final phrases use the four-bar phrase theme as well as the rising seventh theme. The latter seems to be thematically involved in each movement thus far. Though the middle of this movement sounds rather repetitive in its minor third modulation (as Le chasseur maudit did) this might well be an attempt
at reviving harmonic drama after the luxuriance of both the opening and the movements which have gone before. Other than this central movement, the themes are luxurious and lyrical; fully suited to the subject matter. Of special note is the final harmony, which is in a different key from the opening. In the next chapter, discussing the Quintet, I discuss the possibility that Franck considered the idea of progressive tonality but did not employ it in a chamber work because of convention. It is debatable whether this movement of Psyché is “progressively tonal” in a teleological sense, or whether it simply winds up in a different place to where it started. Both are possible: the first might support a programmatic interpretation of some sort of change or progress in Les jardins d’Eros, and the second might suggest that Franck’s harmonic language was moving toward that which Debussy took further: the non-functional – or perhaps here less functional – world of the impressionistic.

**Figure 5.8: Franck, Psyché et Eros (Sketch 4)**

A major

*Allegretto modéré*

1 – 10  Transient. Oscillating on A-sharp (1/2 dim) from 1 – 6, then A7 (suggesting D) from 7 – 8, before back to A-sharp (1/2 dim) from 9 – 10.

11 – 18  Still Transient. 11 – 12: E7 2nd inversion, then as 7 – 10 with interjections from woodwind (similar to first movement).

19 – 24  On V/A V/I B/E alternating in bass; at 23 altered to become augmented chord (i.e. E – G-sharp – B-sharp.)

25 – 32  A I Melody in Viola/Cello

33 – 40  Transition – suggests V/C (V/Vβ)

41 – 44  Diminished chords rising through E, F-sharp, G-sharp, A-sharp (WTs)

45 – 48  A minor i With 7th though, so functionally ambiguous

49 – 54  F-sharp – C-sharp IVα - Iα Plagal cadence into C-sharp

55 – 63  C-sharp Iα Tutti forces; theme very triadic

64 – 71  C-sharp - E Iα – V 2nd subject: with 7th, E via vii7/B

72 – 79  E – G V – WT As 64 – 71
80 – 87  G – B-flat  WT – IVβ  Same material as 64 – 71, but in woodwind  

102 – 109  E-flat – F-sharp  WT – IVα  As 64 – 71  
110 – 113  F-sharp – D-sharp  IVα – WT  
114 – 121  Transition to A, via TT related diminished chords: V/A at 121
122 – 133  A major  I  C-sharp in bass
134 – 136  V/A  V/I  Briefly on E (V/I)
137 – 144  Around C: asserted plagally V/C at 144  
145 – 148  Trans: at 41 – 44 with WTs rising in bass.
149 – 152  A minor  i
153 – 160  Prep for A: through F-sharp major/minor and VII7/A
161 – 168  A major  I  Tutti forces – as 64 – 71
169 – 176  C major  Vα  Sequence, as 64 – 71
177 – 180  E-flat  WT  Sequence, as 64 – 71
181 – 184  G-flat  Completes sequence  
185 – 191  F-sharp minor  ivα  Really close to A, just mixture
192 – 212  A  I  

Poco piu Lento
213 – 217  A  I  As Les Eolides and earlier in Psyché
218 – 223  D ½ dim7 chord
234 – 236  A  I

The opening of this movement seems transient for an extended period, because of the alternation between A-sharp ½ diminished and A7c chords. Even when we reach an E7 chord at bar 11, it does not resolve to our most likely tonic, A. However, A is indeed the most important tonal centre in this piece, with F-sharp also an important modulatory area. Sequences are used employing the diminished chord, such as at Reh. P – Q+7 and Reh. S+24 – T+3. However, surveying the keys in this work, almost all are related by or reached by minor or major thirds. Some foreground dominant activity is present, to be sure, but the main emphasis seems to be on the melodic material, and indeed it is this that is worthy of our attention here. Between Reh. O+3
and O+15, the main theme in the cello is related to those of previous movements with its triadic features; then the third movement theme appears at Reh. O+20. Then at Reh. O+30 we encounter a new idea using the interval of a falling fourth; this interval was part of the melodic material in the third movement.

The most significant melodic event occurs at Reh. O+29; a new theme, based on the seventh theme used predominantly in the first movement (but which has also appeared in the second and third movements) which now appears in C-sharp. This theme then moves through all related minor third relatives – E, G – before different material enters in the harmonic area of B-flat. There are then shifts through E-flat before reaching F-sharp at Reh. R with the falling fourth theme. Harmonies continue to shift (or perhaps a better verb would be “drift”): but at Reh. R+12 we reach A major, lightly tonicised with its dominant. A, as a key, seems to be gathering strength here, albeit merely through repetition. Another minor third modulation propels us into C at Reh. S+3, and we seem to be moving toward C’s dominant: but we are instead confronted with its dominant minor at Reh. S+8. Yet by Reh. S+12 we are back in A minor (shifted to through an F-sharp7 chord – C – A minor) then F-sharp at Reh. S+16. We are reaching the climax; the chords of C-sharp major, a French sixth on G-sharp and then a dominant seventh on the same note lead us to the new transformed seventh theme in A major, triumphant. The minor third modulation does not cease though: we move through C, E-flat and G-flat with this thematic material before returning to A at Reh. T+10. The music settles here, and the falling fourth theme returns in A at Reh. T+18. A brief touch on the Les Eolides motif at Reh. T+31 reminds us of how far the music has progressed, before the piece runs out gently on A, using semitonal figures to confirm itself.

The important factors in this movement are more melodic than harmonic. There is harmonic movement, to be sure, and it is almost exclusively major and minor third relations with some foreground dominant functions. However, this movement has
one of Franck’s best uses of what might accurately be called thematic transformation: the ecstatic theme that appears at Reh. S+24 in this movement is a combination of the seventh theme (used predominantly in the first movement but also appearing in the others) and an earlier falling theme used previously in the final movement (related to that theme beginning at Reh. O+3).

Figure 5.9: Franck, Sommeil De Psyché (Sketch 1), bars 8 – 9 (strings)

Figure 5.10: Franck, Psyché et éros (Sketch 4), reh. O+3 – 10

In some of Franck’s works, his use of “cyclic form” is obvious, and he only recycles themes rather than re-working them. In Psyché et Eros, however, this is clearly not the case: the theme is transformed both melodically and in mood. What was previously a mournful lyrical idea now becomes a joyful burst of love, with full orchestral forces; a complete transformation of the theme’s nature.

Figure 5.11: Franck, Psyché et Eros (Sketch 4), reh. S+24 – 29
These Symphonic Poems demonstrate Franck’s awareness of harmonic relationships and their effect. In *Le chasseur maudit*, Franck demonstrates the ability of axial relatives and minor thirds to articulate structure and underscore activity and underlying lack of attainment respectively. Axial relationships in *Psyché* are not structurally functional, but they may be considered colouristic and underscore the passivity: desirable given the programme. These Symphonic Poems demonstrate Franck’s awareness of axial tonality’s potential to articulate a programme: how he utilises such relationships in absolute music remains to be seen. With this in mind, Chapter Six analyses Franck’s Quintet in F minor. The next chapter begins with an analysis of Beethoven’s late formal alternatives by more closely examining the works that use models discussed above.

Chapter Six

The Mono-Axial Model and the Quintet in F minor
At a glance, the Quintet seems to be broadly mono-axial, at least in terms of its overall key scheme and significant keys within sections. However, this being one of Franck’s first mature works, composed in 1879, we will also find in it the enunciation of a pc set comprising the notes within the tonic axis. This, together with aspects of axial tonality, combine to give the Quintet a uniform sonic world: whether these elements combine coherently in a formal sense, however, is open to debate.

The *Hammerklavier*’s Influence: the Mono-Axial Model

We begin with a brief survey of works which belie the *Hammerklavier*’s mono-axial influence. A number of composers explored the mono-axial model, or at the very least sensed the significance of Beethoven’s *Hammerklavier*. But emulating and understanding the *Hammerklavier* was not necessarily straightforward, as Rosen writes:

> For [some composers] Beethoven’s achievement provoked an emulation which led, and could have led, only to disaster. Both Mendelssohn and Brahms imitated the *Hammerklavier* with singularly awkward results. The sonatas and symphonies of Schumann are constantly embarrassed by the example of Beethoven: their splendour breaks through his influence, but never starts from it. All that is most interesting in the next generation is a reaction against Beethoven, or an attempt to ignore him, a turning away into new directions: all that is weakest submits to his power and pays him the emptiest and most sincere of homages.\(^{416}\)

Rosen is largely correct in this statement; it is certainly true that some of the compositions that the *Hammerklavier* inspired seem empty in their homage, at least as much as their reception histories would suggest. Yet the later works of Brahms (his *Hammerklavier*-inspired Sonata being his Op. 1) including his first and third Symphonies, show a deeper engagement and more thorough understanding of internal processes similar to those of the *Hammerklavier*: these we cannot describe.

---

as stillborn. Brahms’ first Symphony is mono-axial in its overall key scheme (between movements), whilst the first movement of his third relates to the *Hammerklavier*’s first movement, by withholding the dominant.

Although Walter Frisch’s analysis of Brahms’ Op. 1 is primarily concerned with thematic development (and developing variation), his analysis illustrates the problems Brahms encountered when attempting to assimilate the *Hammerklavier*. This is a reasonable assumption of influence given the uncanny likeness between the opening themes of each, though an alternate argument might be that Beethoven’s *Waldstein* Sonata, Op. 53 in C Major, was also influential to the young Brahms.\(^{417}\) Let us compare axial analyses and excerpts of the main themes of Beethoven’s *Hammerklavier* with Brahms’ Op. 1 Piano Sonata.

Figure 6.1: Beethoven, *Hammerklavier* Sonata (Op. 106), bars 1 – 5

![Figure 6.1: Beethoven, *Hammerklavier* Sonata (Op. 106), bars 1 – 5](image)

Figure 6.2: Beethoven, *Hammerklavier* Sonata (Op. 106), adapted from Downes\(^ {418}\)

I

Exposition

| 1 – 44 | B-flat | I |
| 45 – 123 | G | IV\(_{\alpha}\) |

---


Development

124 – 192  E-flat  IV
193 – 200  D  V♭ of IV♭
201 – 226  B  IV♭

Recapitulation

227 – 238  B-flat  I
239 – 266  G-flat  I♭
267 – 272  B minor  iv♭
273 – 405  B-flat  I

II

1 – 46  B-flat  I
47 – 106  B-flat minor  i
107 – 175  B-flat  I

III  Relative to F-sharp minor  Relative to B-flat

1 – 46  F-sharp minor  i  I♭
47 – 72  D  i♭  iα
73 – 75  F-sharp minor  i  i♭
76 – 84  E-flat  IVα  IV
85 – 124  F-sharp minor  i  i♭
125 – 155  F-sharp  I  I♭
156 – 163  G  IV♭  IVα
164 – 165  B minor – major  iv – IV  iv♭ – IV♭
166 – 187  F-sharp minor  i  i♭

IV Largo

1  F – D-flat – G-flat  V – V♭ – I♭
2  G-flat – B  I♭ – IV♭
3 – 8  G-sharp minor  vα of Vα
9 – 10  (A) – V of B-flat  Vα – V

Allegro risoluto

11 – 52  B-flat  I
53 – 83  A-flat  b VII [WT 1]
84 – 110  G-flat  I♭
Comparing this table to that of Brahms’ Op. 1, we can see that Brahms’ emulation is predominantly in the foreground gesture, rather than the overarching key scheme.

Figure 6.3: Brahms, Piano Sonata (Op. 1), bars 1 – 4

Figure 6.4: Brahms, Piano Sonata (Op. 1)

Development (Key change: C minor)

88 – 99 C minor i
100 – 117 Through E-flat (vβ) D-flat (ivβ) then sequence beginning at 111
(Key change: B minor)

118 – 123  Transition to B minor
124 – 131  B minor  \( v \alpha \)
132 – 135  Transitional
136 – 139  Around C minor  \( i \)
140 – 148  Preparing V/V
149 – 152  V/G  V/V
153 – 156  G  V
157 – 160  E minor  \( i \alpha \)
161 – 166  D
167 – 172  C-sharp diminished chord

Recapitulation (Key change: C major)

173 – 180  C7 – then V/C
181 -  C minor . . . then V/V  \( i \)
195 -  C minor . . . then V/V  \( i \)

(Key change: C minor)

198 – 223  C minor  \( i \)
223 – 228  Ddim7 – D♭7 - transitional
229 – 237  F minor  \( iv \)
238 –  Transition
250 -  C  \( V_6/4 \ – V \ – I \)

II
C minor

Andante

1 – 57  C minor  \( i \)

(Key change: C major)

58 – 86  C major  \( I \)

III

E minor

Allegro molto e con fuoco – Scherzo

1 – 102  Broadly E minor  \( i \alpha \)

Più mosso – Trio (Key change, C major)
103 – 211  Broadly C major I

IV
C major
*Allegro con fuoco*

1 – 41  C  I  Tonicised by E opening section
42 – 76  G  V
77 – 100  Sequential downward movement
101 – 106  On E  V/ivα
107 – 172  A minor  ivα  Modulation here, but broadly A minor
173 – 186  Preparation for tonic return – V/V
187 – 193  C (7)  I (7)  Recapitulation, same cadence as first movement
194 – 212  Sequential/modulatory
213 – 215  C  I  Strong arrival of I
216 – 227  On G7  V7
228 – 241  Around Am / F  IV axis
242 – 292  C  I

Though we perceive echoes of the *Hammerklavier* here, in the most significant sense this work attempts to fulfill the classical requirements of sonata form; the *Hammerklavier* was a re-thinking of that process. Although Brahms evidently imitates some surface level characteristics, including the highly unusual use of the subdominant axis as a second tonal area, it seems he has not grasped the deeper formal procedures of the *Hammerklavier*. Brahms does not emulate Beethoven’s flatness and avoidance of dominants; despite the initial “overshooting” of the tonic in the recapitulation, this is “righted” six bars later.

One structural issue lies in the metamorphosis of the exposition’s A minor theme in the development: a lengthy dominant preparation (V/V) precedes it. Frisch observes that this sounds like a re-transition, and indeed it does; yet, the “real” re-
transition (bars 180 – 181) is comparatively weak, so we arrive at the recapitulation “unprepared”, as Frisch explains:

The harmonies actually regress along the circle of fifths, G moving to D (bar 161), and D to a diminished-seventh chord built on C-sharp (bar 167, sounding like vii7 of D). The C-sharp then suddenly drops to C natural, and Brahms bursts into the recapitulation through V7/IV, having bypassed the tonic altogether.\textsuperscript{419}

But why would Brahms choose to do this? We have extensively discussed the avoidance of the dominant previously in this thesis, but if there is a place in which it deserves at least a little attention, surely it is just prior to the recapitulation. Frisch surmises:

The formal process and harmonic syntax of this passage reveal that, as in op. 5, Brahms is attempting (though not particularly succeeding at) an unusual kind of sonata structure – one that undermines the force of a recapitulation: (1) by preceding it directly with a stable thematic episode, (2) by withholding genuine dominant preparation, and (3) by then passing immediately through the tonic to the subdominant.\textsuperscript{420}

Briefly considering the other movements, it becomes clearer that Brahms’ emulation is in foreground detail only; the slow movement follows the first (rather than Beethoven’s reverse) and neither it nor the Scherzo is monumentally long. The finale movement is lengthy, and uses a varied form of the first movement’s theme, largely in 9/8. This might be one of Brahms’ first experiments with developing variation, or possibly a type of cyclic form; nevertheless, the reminiscence is clear.

Brahms’ third Symphony also shares characteristics with his Op. 1. It seems he has a habit of destabilising the sense of arrival at the recapitulation, reserving the stronger recapitulatory event for the finale. This Symphony, however, was composed at Brahms’ musical maturity, and arguably demonstrates a deeper

\textsuperscript{419} Frisch, \textit{Brahms and the Principle of Developing Variation}, 55.
\textsuperscript{420} Ibid.
understanding of late Beethovenian form. Nevertheless, compared to the corresponding section in Beethoven’s Sonata, Brahms’ comes across as “concerned more with melodies than with formal exigencies”.421 This may explain why Brahms chose to compose this way when it seems that he could, perhaps, have made different compositional choices. We must remember that this was written when Brahms was a tender 20-year-old, surely under the weight of a myriad of influences, Beethoven being one of the most significant. One might reasonably conclude that Brahms did not fully understand, as a young composer, all of the internal processes at work in the Hammerklavier, though he had clearly grasped some of them.

Another composer influenced by Beethoven’s Op. 106 was Mendelssohn, whose Op. 106 (oddly enough) has many gestural similarities with Beethoven’s.

**Figure 6.5: Mendelssohn, Piano Sonata (Op. 106) bars 1 – 5**

The key, opus number, register of first subject, keys used in movements (B-flat, B-flat minor, E and B-flat) and some sections within movements all correspond to the Hammerklavier. Mendelssohn also uses a fugal development in G in the first movement. Yet there are significant differences that likely influenced Rosen to describe this as an “empty” homage: Mendelssohn does not attempt to withhold the dominant, and so the first movement, though short, is tonally complete in itself in a sonata form sense. This Sonata is also significantly shorter than Beethoven’s

---

421 Ibid.
Op. 106, with a recording of the *Hammerklavier* lasting around 45 – 50 minutes, whilst Mendelssohn’s Op. 106 only lasting about 18. Given the disparities, it seems unlikely Mendelssohn projected a work of *Hammerklavier* proportions, instead choosing to emulate smaller foreground details.

Furthermore, Franck himself emulated the *Hammerklavier*. The first section of his organ work *Final* (from his *Six Pieces*) is similar in gesture, both in terms of melodic shape, key of the first theme, and the keys used in the work as a whole. Franck’s composition is in one movement, but does include a central slow section, adhering to his preference for a tripartite layout.

**Figure 6.6: Franck, Final (Op. 21), bars 28 – 32**

![Figure 6.6: Franck, Final (Op. 21), bars 28 – 32](image)

**Figure 6.7: Franck, Final (Op. 21)**

B-flat major

*Allegro Maestoso*

**Section A**

- 1 – 42        B-flat         I
- 42 – 80       G minor       vi / ivα
- 81 – 94       D              Iα
- 95 – 122      G (B, E-flat, G) IVα (IVβ, IV)

**Section B (Key change: F-sharp major)**

- 123 – 134     C-sharp (V/F-sharp)  Vβ
- 135 – 146     F-sharp         Iβ
- 147 – 154     A-sharp         #VII (enharmonically I)
- 155 – 169     F-sharp         Iβ
(Key change: No key signature – A minor/C major but this is not the key until bar 202)

170 – 181 flux
182 – 194 E IIα or V/VIα
202 – 214 flux, A minor, G
215 – 234 B minor IVβ
235 – 244 Am – D-sharp dim – F-sharp – D7

Section C (Key change at bar 407: B-flat major)

245 – 294 B-flat (F) I (V)
295 – 309 D Iα
310 – 316 F-sharp Iβ
317 – 352 B-flat I
353 – 369 E-flat IV
370 – 387 B-flat I

Final was one of Franck’s first large scale organ works. It seems to meander somewhat, however, and has not enjoyed the same popularity in the organ repertoire as, say, the Trois Chorals. If the mono-axial model is to be successful, as in Beethoven’s Hammerklavier, we must consider other factors: shape and length of movements, type of development, mixture, and shaping and placement of immanent and/or transcendent dominants. Whether Franck realises this more successfully later in his career is the subject of the remainder of this thesis.

Franck’s Piano Quintet in F minor

It is appropriate to begin the formal analysis of Franck’s absolute works with the Quintet, as it is one of his first mature works; this strain of chromaticism is not present in his earlier compositions. Furthermore, this piece has afforded a great deal of analytical attention by musicologists who have otherwise written little or nothing else on Franck. One reason for this may be the prevalence of what Cohn refers to as “tonal poles” in the work (triads which share the same axis but no
common tones, such as C minor and E major). Cohn argues for special consideration of “tonal poles” because:

First, contrary motion is involved in the voice-leading between juxtaposed polar triads in closed position. (This is true of no other types of closed-position triadic juxtapositions where common tones are absent.) The contrary motion allows the second special feature of the polar relation to emerge: each triad contains the other’s two most piquant tendency tones, the raised seventh and the flattened sixth degree (or some enharmonic versions(s) thereof).\textsuperscript{422}

According to Cohn, these special qualities mean that when “tonal poles” are juxtaposed they have the ability to “annihilate tonality” due to the uncertainty created by the presence of multiple voice-leading functions. Though the voice-leading between tonal poles is logical, Cohn describes the effect of tonal pole juxtaposition as “uncanny.”\textsuperscript{423} However, this is but one element to consider here.

The following table outlines the important keys of the movement.

\begin{table}
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
\textbf{Figure 6.8: Franck, Piano Quintet, I} & \\
\hline
F minor & \\
\textit{Molto moderato quasi lento} & \\
1 – 19 & F minor & i & Introductory double-dotted scalar figure \\
19 – 25 & A-flat minor – E-flat & V\beta – V/v\beta & \\
\textit{Maestoso} & \\
26 – 33 & E-flat, then to A minor & V/v\beta – i\alpha & E-flat – C major – C minor – A minor \\
34 – 37 & D-flat – A minor & I\beta – i\alpha & ‘Tonal pole’ oscillation \\
38 – 39 & Unison on E-flat & & \\
40 – 44 & Chain of diminished 7ths ending on D-flat which forms an E dim. 7 (vii7/i) & & \\
\textit{Allegro} & \\
45 – 49 & F minor / D-flat area & i & VI \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{table}


\textsuperscript{423} Ibid., 21.
50 – 82  F minor  I  First subject
82 – 89  D-flat major  Iβ
90 – 103  C-sharp major  Iβ – Vα – V/V – IV – Iβ
   Second subject, ‘tonal pole’ oscillation
104 – 111  V/D-flat – V/ E-flat  V/Iα – V/Vβ  Sequence
112 – 123  E-flat  V/Vβ  Transition
124 – 149  A-flat & A-flat minor  Vβ & vβ  Second subject, sounds like closing theme
150 – 158  C-sharp minor  ivα  Development
159 – 162  E-flat  V/Vβ  Development of 1st subject
163 – 184  Key unclear: many augmented/diminished sonorities
185 – 192  Around F minor – altered V/E  i – V/vα  Based on answer of first subject
193 – 206  E minor – E major  vα – Vα  Introductory motif (false recapitulation)
207 – 215  C-sharp major  V/ivβ  Second subject bar 203
216 – 225  F-sharp minor – toward A  ivβ – Iα  Introductory motif
226 – 241  A major - D-flat  Iα – Iβ  Second subject, tonic axis
242 – 250  D-flat and E-flat  Iβ – V/Vβ  WT approach to tonic
259 – 270  Sequence, fermatas, approach to tonic; first subject emerging. Diminished sonorities
271 – 300  F minor  i  Recapitulation: first subject
301 – 309  V/G-flat major  V/IVβ
309 – 311  G-flat major  IVβ  From second subject

*Molto moderato quasi lento / Allegro*
312 – 319  D-flat major  IVβ  Piano/strings alternating, as earlier in movement

320 – 322  D-flat – German sixth of v

*Allegro*
323 – 330  C major  V
331 – 357  F minor - major  i – I  Second subject
358 – 365  F minor – A major  i – Iα
366 – 383  Chromatic preparation for i
384 – 399  Complete I axis  I – Iα – Iβ  Using second subject; C+ = V/A

*Animato*
400 – 411  F minor  i  Fragment of second subject; chromaticism

Più Presto

412 – 419  F minor  i  Uses C7♭5 as dominant
420 – 426  Chromatic sequence: French sixths used
427 – 440  F minor  i  First subject; end ‘dissolves’

The opening movement gives an impression of the music contracting and retracting, with a chromatically moving bass-line. Emotionally, it feels intense, in the way of Franck’s Quartet (discussed in the next chapter). The opening slow section can be considered a complete miniature ternary form in itself, with the lyrical piano theme of bars 6 – 13 recurring in the dominant axis key of A-flat; this is a similar opening gambit to the D minor Symphony with its minor third opposition. The cadence into this lyrical theme is the same in F minor and A-flat (at bar 19), as well as later in the Quintet (bars 40 – 41 of the second movement). The brief touch on G-flat at bar 12 foreshadows the emphasis on the subdominant axis, which substantiates later. Despite a chromatically rising bass-line from bars 14 – 16, Franck overshoots C (V) in bar 17. Oddly though, a perfect cadence into E-flat (V/V♭) occurs in bar 22, the strongest we have experienced so far, which perseveres into the Maestoso. Unusually though, the “active” E-flat does not bring any new thematic material, instead using the double dotted theme of the opening. Then we move through C major, C minor and A minor to get to the tonic axis, all whilst growing in dynamic intensity. The introduction reaches its climax at bar 34, where D-flat and A minor chords alternate; this is significant, as they are “tonal poles” (in Cohn’s words) with no common tones, but tonally neutral to one another and the tonic.

Let us consider these “tonal poles”: how we interpret them will have significant implications for our interpretation of this movement overall. We know that D-flat
and A minor are tonally neutral, and Cohn suggests this relationship “annihilates”
tonality, in that D-flat defines A minor by two subdominant voice-leadings and
one dominant voice-leading, whilst A minor defines D-flat by two dominant and
one subdominant voice-leadings. These sound more or less equivalent (Cohn’s
point), but this also means that phrase structure becomes very important: here, it is
D-flat that occurs on the downbeat of the phrase, and hence has the stronger claim
for tonicity. In technical terms, we might describe D-flat as thetic and A minor as
anacrusic, in accordance with David Greene’s theory on temporality in Mahler’s
music. However, if we remove phrase structure from the equation, it is only the
hierarchy between two chords (here, D-flat and A minor) that is attenuated – not
tonality itself. As mentioned in Chapter Two, the tonal pole represents the non plus
ultra of ambivalence within diatonic axial relationships but does not annihilate
tonality outright. If we consider the notes here as a pitch-class set comprising g-
sharp – a – c – c-sharp – e – f, then the tonal poles play a special role of articulating
all the pitches of the given set. Franck’s use of this pc set continues throughout the
Quintet, and he uses it to bring about unity from a micro to a macro level.

The rough harmonic outline of the opening Moderato and Maestoso indicates a tonic
– dominant – tonic layout. The double-dotted theme provides the main melodic
material, together with the move to the axial dominant, which uses this material as
well. However, even though all the tonic axis members are present here, Franck
does not define the move away from and back to the tonic thematically.

A chain of diminished sevenths leads us to the Allegro, which begins around D-
flat, sounding as VI in F minor. Franck’s technique here is similar to the Lisztian
technique of using whole-tone related keys in expository sections, which, as here,
are circular and do not achieve anything, finding their way back to the tonic. After

424 David B. Greene, Mahler, consciousness and temporality (New York: Gordon and Breach,
1984), 48.
a statement of the first subject – a descending scale figure beginning on the sixth scale degree – there is a modulation rising through wholetones from bars 56 – 63. We sense this modulation strongly because of the arpeggio-based thematic material; again, it is Liszt-like in nature. At bar 64 a sequence begins which takes us back to F minor, with falling semitones in the violin melody; analyst Jorgen Jersild pays special attention to these. Then, Franck alters the A-flat minor chord to an augmented one by semitonal downward movement of the root-tone, which effects a change of axis through A-flat minor (Vβ), C-flat augmented (enharmonically iv/ivβ), G minor (iv/ivα), B-flat augmented (IVaug), F-sharp minor (ivβ), F augmented (Iaug) to F major (I.) This effectively emasculates each chord as it becomes the subdominant of the following chord. We might describe this as “extreme subdominant voice-leading”, a composing out of the D-flat – A minor relationship. However, the harmony III+ – V7 – i also occurs twice between bars 71 – 73, which stabilises the key. The second subject begins at bar 90: a passionate pianissimo theme in the piano that modulates through a diminished seventh of minor thirds: C-sharp major, E major, G major and B-flat major before returning to C-sharp. Each harmonic area also touches on its hexatonic pole, such as A minor in C-sharp major. Cohn describes this passage as showing:

[There is] a strict pattern of pitch-class transposition through chromatic space. Furthermore . . . the transposed material consists of a major triad alternating with its (minor) hexatonic pole. Each alternation engages all six pcs of the hexatonic system, so that the systems engaged serially by each passage are defined with maximum efficiency.

Cohn’s analysis is correct, but we must also consider the effect of the modulations that give the second subject its distinctive sound. Minor thirds have a dominant function due to the tones belonging to different wholetone scales, and this section

---

seems remarkably animated in a tonal sense; yet, it also possesses an attendant lack of tonal control. The minor thirds seem to drive the music forward, but without a clear sense of directionality, so although the systems may be “defined with maximum efficiency”, the passage seems directionless nonetheless.

A transition using a long E-flat pedal point begins as bar 115, before a version of the second subject appears in A-flat major and minor (Vβ and vβ). Again, the harmony features a juxtaposition of tonal poles: between A-flat major and E minor (spelled as F-flat minor) at bars 126 and 134. What seems particularly odd about this is that A-flat – a significant key in a formal sense as it is part of the dominant axis – coincides with a “closing” type theme (see Figure 6.9). This effectively brings the exposition to a halt, and is problematic if Franck wishes to articulate tonality in a sonata form context. Rosen explains these sonata processes: “The first section, or exposition, has two events, a movement or modulation to the dominant, and a final cadence on the dominant. Each of these events is characterised by an increase [emphasis mine] in rhythmic animation.” Franck’s A-flat theme is surely far away from what we might describe as “rhythmic animation”, particularly given that we are close to the development section. A sudden hush at bar 144 begins a piano solo, using fragments of the first subject and modulating to D-flat. The development then begins at bar 150 with a reference to the area of D minor followed by an arrival into E-flat major at bar 159, developing the first subject. Then, transitions and sequential periods begin. The interesting aspect to note, however, is that almost every sequential period moves in either semitones or minor thirds: a similar effect to that of Le chasseur maudit discussed in the previous chapter.

Figure 6.9: Franck, Piano Quintet, I, bars 135 – 144

---

427 The Quintet shares this with Le chasseur maudit, discussed in the previous chapter.
At bar 193, however, we encounter a strong false recapitulation placed early in the development – indeed, a good 77 bars before the recapitulation proper. One reason the false recapitulation sounds convincing may be because there is so much chromaticism surrounding it. By way of Classical precedent, Mozart illustrates how a degree of wit is required for a false recapitulation to succeed: his Symphony No. 38 in D has a false recapitulation on the dominant at bar 189, which only lasts two bars before it turns to the minor (the recapitulation proper, however, is less faithful to the original harmony of the main theme, this being the “joke”); and Symphony No. 41 Jupiter, which recapitulates not the main theme but its restatement from bar 24, before dissolving after a mere six bars. These instances are short, witty devices; Franck’s false recapitulation seems prolix in comparison.
A restatement of the second subject after this is significant as it reverses the order of keys we heard the second subject in earlier. Initially, the order was C-sharp major – E major: this time it is E major – C-sharp major. The next significant key area is F-sharp minor, emphasising the subdominant axis. Franck places further emphasis on the second subject between bars 226 – 241, where it is stated in A major and D-flat major – both members of the tonic axis – and transitioned between by way of a German sixth. After the period in D-flat, the melody moves up a minor third to begin the melodic recapitulation in F minor, though the underlying harmony suggests D-flat until bar 246. We reach F minor at bar 250. Following this, a regular recapitulation of both the first and second subjects occurs, albeit with some chromatic alteration, and harmonically we are in the realm of the tonic and subdominant axes. This demonstrates the mono-axial emphasis in this work, even in the transition to the recapitulation. Consequently, however, this thwarts any sense of tonic re-attainment and resolution. Rosen explains:

> When the tension between tonic and dominant has been so weakened with no substitute offered, resolution loses its meaning. What the ‘recapitulation’ resolves is not the harmonic tensions of the opening, but the tensions set up by all the different tonalities in the course of the piece.\(^{429}\)

Though Rosen is writing about the Classical period, it seems reasonable to apply this criterion to a later Romantic work, provided we consider Romantic compositional concerns. Hereby, the keys focused on in the recapitulation do not seem to fulfill this process: instead it is the pc set and its related keys. Yet, although the recapitulation and coda are both based around F minor/major and the pc set, the foreground chromatic material sounds as though it belongs in the development, not the end of the movement. Furthermore, the music requires sustained absence from the tonic for the recapitulation to sound like a re-attainment. The final bars are particularly problematic: although Franck cadences with a strong V\(^\flat\)9 – i6 in F minor between bars 432 – 433, and he reiterates the

---

\(^{429}\) Ibid., 92.
cadence using a German sixth on the flat second scale degree. With the combination of the octave F in the bass, this progression sounds like a German sixth in B-flat that does not resolve. Consequently, neither the F minor nor the final four bars sound convincing; yet, this is not the impression given by the entire form. One might make an argument to consider the dramatic minor tensions of the piece and the possibility of non-resolution being desirable. In the chamber works of Brahms, for example, the music basks in the attainment of the tonic minor, even if it gives the impression of darkness or tragedy: in his F minor Piano Quintet, for example, closure in the minor mode is not only attained, but emphasised and even grimly celebrated. In this movement of Franck’s, I suggest that the pc set succeeds in unifying the “sound”: if we infer sonata form processes, however, this movement does not fulfill them fully.

At this point it is worth examining another analyst’s views. In the article “Parsimony and Extravagance”, Cook examines passages of Franck’s Quintet which feature tonal poles and the surrounding harmonic events. The two instances he discusses are from bars 26 – 37 (the chromatic sequence followed by a D-flat – A minor juxtaposition) – which he describes as “parsimonious” aside from the D-flat/A minor “extravagance” – and the eight bar sequence between bars 124 – 131 (beginning in C-sharp major and ascending in minor thirds, including each new tonic’s tonal pole) – which he describes as “extravagant”.

In the second instance, despite the possibility of smoothing the voice-leading between the modulations of a minor third using their common tone, Franck emphasises the distance by obscuring the modulation with a seventh. This intrigues Cook: he writes, “One might reasonably expect Franck at least to make use of this [common tone] if not emphasise it. Instead, the mediating seventh chords obscure the common tone.

430 I define these terms in Chapter Two.
One notices instead the extravagance of the voice-leading.” I suggest that Franck may have crafted the passage Cook describes as predominantly parsimonious as such because of its earliness in the movement. The tonal plan is still emerging, and it is indeed a touch on the key of the dominant (C minor in bar 29), but the parsimonious voice-leading smoothes the modulation and it is hardly dramatised. The extravagant passage, in contrast, is harmonically and thematically dramatic: the tonal poles are juxtaposed (e.g. 91 – 92: C-sharp major – A minor) and the music suddenly modulates by minor third (e.g. 93 – 94 C-sharp7 – E major) moving axes and wholetone scales. Modulation by a minor third is by its nature “active” and creates harmonic drama, but at this juncture it is more appropriate: we are in the exposition and this is the second subject.

Cook’s interpretations of these effects differ slightly to my analysis. He states that the first (parsimonious) passage “stresses a diatonic relation – relative major and minor – and a chromatic relationship easily integrated into diatonic interpretation – parallel major and minor.” This passage is relatively straightforward and his analysis seems reasonable. However, he also argues that the second sequence “stresses chromatic relationships; the hexatonic poles are difficult to interpret tonally, as are the seventh-chord mediations between sequential iterations.” Yet if we interpret these relationships in light of an axial-tonal system, their functions become much easier to understand diatonically, despite their undeniably rich chromatic context. Harmonic poles represent the greatest distance within a single axis in which there are no common tones between chords, yet because of their proximity and voice-leading qualities such chords remain closely related and do not annihilate tonality. The minor-third sequence represents a movement through alternating whole-tone scales; a technique Franck uses a great deal in the works of

---

432 Ibid., 116.
433 Ibid.
the 1870s. This gives the impression of harmonic action without stressing the dominant. The only problem, which one also finds in *Le chasseur maudit*, is that the music can begin to feel repetitive, particularly if this chromatic/tonal contrast does not coincide with thematic contrast.

Let us consider what Franck’s structural intentions may have been. In some of the harmonic tactics of this movement, there seem to be tautological or problematic elements: the tonic arrives before the recapitulation proper; entire structural sections (such as the opening) repeat themselves almost verbatim in un-neutral keys; and the tonic is undermined so severely at the end of the movement that progressive tonality seems almost viable. Though it is quite possible that Franck did not intentionally use Beethovenian models, what we do find in such exemplars – particularly in Beethoven’s Op. 127 – is a turning away from the “heroic” type of sonata form. In its place is an emphasis on something less dramatic, perhaps comparable to the finale of Mahler’s Sixth Symphony in which the music is made to “fail”, or the first movement of Beethoven’s Ninth Symphony, discussed in Chapter Five, in which cadences at crucial junctures are undermined by way of weak inversions. Therefore, we might describe this movement of Franck’s Quintet as a de-powered sonata form, or perhaps a non-dramatic one. Of Beethoven’s Op. 127, Kerman writes: “a process of continuous free variation seems to supplant traditional developmental energy in [Op. 127’s first] movement, in interest at least, even perhaps in function” and later:

> This movement is a burgeoning, not a dramatic statement. . . . Sensibility, not structure, is the heart of this piece. Obviously form as such is not the major expressive element. Yet the art required to mold unobtrusive form that will

---

support the repetitive leisure of such a piece is very considerable, as many nineteenth-century composers (or their listeners) learned to their sorrow.436

It seems viable that in the moving away from “heroic” sonata form to a more lyrical structure, Franck’s efforts became somewhat confused. The result seems like a half de-powered form: some moments are beautifully lyrical, others repetitive and ill conceived. Though on the one hand the mono-axiality of the *Hammerklavier* is absorbed, both Franck and Brahms – in his Op. 1 – struggle to break from Beethoven’s heroic style, which the mono-axial model was (arguably) a reaction against. It is also possible that Franck considered the idea of progressive tonality, given the extent to which he undermines the tonic and emphasises other key centers (often the subdominant, as in this movement). Franck’s employment of progressive tonality in *Psyché*, discussed in Chapter Five, is further evidence that he may have come close to using it in a more conventional work such as the Quintet. It is also possible that Franck is making some sorts of preparation for the second movement, which we will now consider.

**Figure 6.10: Franck, Piano Quintet, II**

*A minor* (iα overall)

*Lento, con molto sentimento*

I

1 – 4 A minor i

5 – 8 F minor iβ Melody inverted. Axial shift.

9 – 12 F minor – A minor iβ – i

13 – 19 A minor i Each part moving semitonally

II

20 – 35 Harmonically, as 1 – 16. Fuller figuration in all parts.

36 – 37 A major I Similar to 17, but in major

38 – 40 Transition: F-sharp major (IVα) – E-flat (V/Vβ) then French sixth on A-flat

III (Key change: D-flat)

41 – 46 D-flat Iα

---

436 Ibid., 209 - 10.
Chromatic transition and emotional climax

D-flat \( i_\alpha \) Second subject from first movement. 59: hexatonic pole (i) 66 – 68. Sequence in whole-tones: V/D-flat; V/E-flat; V/F

IV

On C9 \( i_\beta \) C pedal in the bass; alternating with B diminished 9 as a sort of dominant; C-flats in melody; original violin theme but interval flattened.

On D9 \( i_\beta \)

In the area of the dominant; re-transition

(Key change, A minor)

F – A major-minor \( i_\beta - I - i \) Melody as opening: piano

F minor \( i_\beta \) Textural variation

E9 – F minor – i (V9 – \( b\)vi) i As bars 9 – 11

A minor \( i \) As 12 – 15

Unison A rises to unison B-flat in piano bass

B-flat \( IV_\beta \) Theme linked to Variation III

F11 \( I_\beta 11 \)

Alternation of B ½ diminished and F7

F7 chord \( I_\beta 7 \) Acts as V of A minor like German sixth

A minor \( i \)

This movement is a set of variations. The violin’s first utterance emphasises the subdominant as it falls through D – B – A, and there is a iv\( \beta \) – i movement in bar two.

Figure 6.11: Franck, Piano Quintet, II, bars 9 - 12
A feature of this movement, which makes itself known early on, is minor-major alteration, such as bar three, where there is a sudden shift from A minor to A major, which reverts in bar four.

This contributes to the feeling of semitonal contraction and retraction that was so overt in the first movement, and indeed is a subset of the pc set. Passages such as bars 17 – 19, in which every voice in the piano part moves semitonally, reinforce this sensation. Early in this movement, Franck makes his awareness of axial foreground function known. There are instances where the chord of E functions as the dominant of both A minor and F minor (bars 9 – 12, illustrated as Figure 6.11). This indicates an awareness of shared dominant function between the axes at a foreground level, and if this is the case on the surface, it is unlikely to have escaped Franck’s attention at a deeper level.

The second variation is harmonically similar to the first, until bar 36 when there is a shift to A major then F-sharp major: more subdominant emphasis. Also worth noting is the prevalence of augmented sixths, used both “regularly” (in terms of resolution) and as a type of enhanced dominant, such as bars 45 – 46 in which a German sixth in A-flat alternates with an A-flat major chord. Also apparent in this movement is the emphasis on the C-sharp – A minor pc set that was so prominent in the first movement (particularly with its emphasis on tonal poles). Axial-tonal procedures are still at play to be sure, but at the same time, there is a sense that this pc set – comprising all the tones of the tonic axis – is where Franck intends us to focus aurally. For example, he emphasises members of the pc set at cadence points, such as the D-flat on the tenth quaver beat of bar six, and the F on the seventh quaver beat of bar eleven.
A deeper manifestation of this pc set is the modulation from A minor to D-flat at bar 41. This is the “composing out” of a micro event from the first movement at a macro level. As the chords are $V_\flat 5_\flat 9$ (second inversion) – $I$ in D-flat, apart from the C-natural to D-flat movement, all the voices at this cadence use subdominant or “falling” voice leading. This weakens the cadence, as Franck intends: using a pc set as a unification device means that the movement can be organised in a tonally non-combative way. The manifestation of the pc set continues into the third movement.

**Figure 6.12: Franck, Piano Quintet, III**

Interpreted with F as tonic

*Allegro non troppo, ma con fuoco*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 – 16</td>
<td>Suggests $V$ of D minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 – 32</td>
<td>Suggests $V$ of G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 – 48</td>
<td>Suggests $G$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49 – 52</td>
<td>Suggests $G$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53 – 56</td>
<td>Suggests F-sharp minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57 – 72</td>
<td>Suggests F major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73 – 80</td>
<td>$F$ major/minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81 – 88</td>
<td>Toward $D$ minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89 – 96</td>
<td>F-sharp minor - A minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97 – 112</td>
<td>$F$ major/minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113 – 118</td>
<td>Dominant axis sweep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119 – 134</td>
<td>$F$ – A-flat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135 – 146</td>
<td>C-flat/E-flat7 (acting as V) and enhanced G diminished chord</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key change to B minor**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>147 – 174</td>
<td>$B$ major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175 – 179</td>
<td>$B$ minor, then dissolves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180 – 188</td>
<td>Suggests $G$ minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>189 – 198</td>
<td>$B$ minor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(Key change: F major)*
199 – 210 C major/minor v First subject
211 – 218 A Iα From first subject
219 – 230 Tonic axis sweep x2 I axis From first subject
231 – 246 F-sharp minor ♭II Interlude; F-sharp minor/D
247 – 254 Chromatic sequence
255 – 258 B-flat minor iv Rhythmic emphasis on beats 1 and 2
259 – 266 G minor V/V or ii
267 – 270 G major V/V
271 – 274 Around E minor vα
275 – 278 A minor iα
279 – 296 Real sequence to F major (but on V, I, 291 – 296) uses cyclic theme from second movement
297 – 301 Transition: C in bass but harmony contracting and retracting around it, no clear key.
301 – 305 C+ chord (enhanced dominant, all notes of V whole tone scale)
306 – 313 F major i First subject
314 – 321 F – V of D minor i – V/iα Moving up a major third
322 – 325 F-sharp minor ivβ Plagal-type cadence
326 – 329 A minor iα As above – moves up a minor third to sit on C; becomes V7 of F
330 – 345 F minor i First subject in minor
346 – 351 Partial-axial sweep through E7, G-sharp7 and C-sharp7
352 – 403 F-sharp minor ivβ Second subject; subdominant
404 – 409 Transition, through F minor, E minor, to E flat minor
410 – 417 E-flat minor v/Vβ Five bar phrase
417 – 421 D minor iα As 410 – 414, but D minor
422 – 427 Chromatic transition: oblique arrival
428 – 443 D-flat major Iβ Cyclic theme from movements 1 and 2
444 – 481 F minor – major i Cyclic theme
482 – 491 D-flat major – transition Iβ D-flat, first inversion
502 – 509 (Four bars which repeat) Through A Ger6, F7, A maj, C7
510 – 516 D-flat on 510 downbeat, then F on downbeat of 512 – this repeats itself; D-flat/B-flat sounds like strong contender for tonality
516 – 520 Through descending F scale with ½2 and ½6 (no 7th)
The key is uncertain from the opening of the finale, which although interpreted in F minor strongly suggests other keys, such as A minor, and also uses F-sharp major in bar 14, the tonal pole of D minor. The first 32 bars emphasise notes within the hexatonic pc set, though notes outside it are also present: A is on the downbeat, and C and C-sharp also occur. The dotted theme, which begins in the piano at bar 13, foreshadows the first subject, which will not arrive for some time yet. However, this theme also includes a harmonic reminiscence of previous tonal events in the form of a $V_7\flat 5$ in second inversion in bar 16. This is the same chord used to move from A minor to D-flat in the second movement. However, the rustling violin figuration continues whilst the key is still undetermined.

G major (wholetone related) becomes a significant player between bars 33 and 48: it is by no means clear-cut, as there is little definition of key, but D7 sonorities begin to sound like V7. Between bars 49 – 52 and 53 – 56 the suggested key area begins to drop by semitone, beginning around G in the first four bar instance then F-sharp in the second. It is only in bar 57 that the harmony begins to move toward F major: the piano had suggested an outline of the first subject at bar 49, but it takes until bar 73 for the first subject proper to arrive in the strings. Prior to its arrival, F had been tainted with D-flats and E-flats, which made it sound like a dominant (and indeed, this is one interpretation of the end of the work: that F sounds like the dominant of B-flat). The D-flats are sometimes part of the German sixth that Franck is so fond of, which can reinforce F as the tonic if they resolve traditionally. However, the E-flats have the opposite effect, and the German sixths do not always resolve to $V_6/4$. This is one of the features of Franck’s foreground harmony that undermines his foreground tonicity. Sometimes the German sixths appear and traditionally, as $\flat VI – V$, but the addition of #6 to chords – such as in
the Violin Sonata – can have an emasculating effect. If #6 is added to a tonic chord (as occurs the Violin Sonata, discussed in Chapter Nine) and then resolves in the “proper” way, the music will end up in the key of the major mediant. Hence, when Franck adds #6 to an F major chord at bar 69 in this movement, the effect is unusual and undermines rather than confirms the tonicity, even though the German sixth is left unresolved.

Consistent use of the pc set, however, can achieve tonal unity, and this seems to be one of Franck’s intentions in this work. The first subject, which has taken 73 bars to arrive, uses pitches exclusively from the row (aside from a singular B-flat in bar 86, which acts as an upper neighbour to A). Bars 79 – 80 even use one of the augmented chords from the row to tonicise F, the key of the movement overall or, at least, the strongest contender for tonicity at this juncture.

Once it has arrived, the register of the first subject rises, and development ensues. At bar 113 we get a sweep of F’s dominant axis. This coincides with a definite change in texture: instead of the jagged, register-shifting piano chords we have had until now, this passage utilises flowing arpeggios. In this case, the shift signals a move to a new key and thematic area – tonally around the supertonic axis and thematically introducing fragments of the second subject. In Chapter Two I discussed the importance of considering how chords interpreted in an axial way function, rather than rudimentarily assigning axial names to them unreflectively. The title “supertonic axis” is often a misnomer: more frequently, composers achieve musical stasis by using areas that we might describe as supertonic axis members in a wholetone related manner, rather than preparation for a dominant axis harmony. Here, however, the supertonic axis does prepare the dominant axis, a rare case. It also encompasses the key of the second subject. This transition begins a bar 127, where we are beginning to enter the realm of the supertonic axis, beginning with V/C-flat and then C-flat itself. At bar 147, the music changes key to
B major and the piano plays the second subject, in B major (ii₆) though the
harmony also references G minor and E-flat major in bars 149 and 153 respectively;
touching on each key in the supertonic axis at a foreground level. It is also relevant
to note that the melody of the second subject encompasses a transposed version of
the tonic pc set, this new version being [2, 3, 6, 7, 10, 11.] At bar 163 the second
subject turns to B minor. These keys, at first glance, are not problematic: they
contrast with the tonic and incite contrast within their own foreground activity by
using their own axial relatives. These relationships, such as B minor – G minor and
B minor – E-flat major, are similar to the tonal poles in the second subject of the
first movement, which contrasts C-sharp major and A minor. It is also worth
noting that the relationship between F minor and B minor, a tritone, is the same
one that Franck uses in his Symphony, where D and A-flat also share a special
relationship. Though we cannot be sure exactly what Franck’s opinion of such axial
relationships was, we can be sure that he was aware of their existence and used
them for these sorts of expressive effects. Furthermore, his persistent use of them
throughout his late period, across genres, suggests an interest and preoccupation
that supersedes mere curiosity.

The music remains around B minor and its associated motivic area until bar 199,
when there is another key change to D minor/F major, and the development
begins. Here we have a large mixture of keys, as we might expect. There are some
particularly dense harmonic moments, several of which are worthy of analytical
attention. From bars 207 – 227, the foreground chords are all rooted in the pc set,
moving through A-flat, C, E, A, E7, A, C-sharp, E, F, A and C-sharp and so forth. It
seems that Franck is experimenting with the potential of this pc set, in terms of
both its melodic scope and its harmonic relationships, the second of which is the
case here. This chordal movement accompanies development of the first subject,
which is moving sequentially upward in register. Another significant moment is
the modulation to F-sharp minor, as how Franck attains F-sharp minor further
belies his awareness of the possibility of axial relatives to tonicise at a foreground level: an F7 chord acts as Vα/F-sharp minor allowing the music to move simply from one to the next between bars 230 – 231. This is similar to the foreground activity in bar nine of the second movement.

The second subject reappears at bar 279. This time Franck presents the theme in real sequence, transposed up a tone each time from its beginnings in C-sharp major (Iβ), through E-flat major (iiβ, or a wholetone relative) to F major (the tonic, but here used in second inversion). The reader may well realise that two of these keys strongly utilise the pc set tones, contrasting with the earlier instance of the second subject which used the transposed version of the set. A dominant arrives in the guise of an augmented chord; significant as this encompasses all tones of the dominant axis in a single triad. The pc set hence has the ability to affirm its own tonicity as this augmented triad exists within it. F major arrives at bar 306, but modulation continues; from here, the significant emphasis is on F-sharp minor, as in the first movement.

Perhaps the most significant formal moment of the recapitulation is the reappearance of the cyclic theme, first heard at bar 90 of the first movement. At bar 429 this theme reappears in D-flat (Iβ), one of Franck’s many instances of cyclicism in a multi-movement work. This theme is stated again at bar 444, in F minor, this time combining with the first subject of the finale and emphasising A-flat (Vβ). Here, we come to an interesting juncture. Though Franck alters the time signature from 4/4 in the first movement to 3/4 in the third, and the second time we hear the cyclic theme it is combined with the finale first subject, I would argue that the cyclic theme has not essentially changed in nature. It is not a reminiscence of a past musical-tonal world – it is a reminder of the musical-tonal world we are still very much present in. Perhaps this relates to the unified sonic world of the pc set, but regardless, the inference remains. Arguably, thematic development was not what
Franck intended, and the return is only meant to be regarded as a simple thematic reminiscence, not a grand thematic transformation. However, I suggest that when a composer is deepening layers of complexity within a composition – as Franck undeniably is in a tonal (read chromatic) and formal sense – other parameters such as thematic and rhythmic relationships (which I will discuss later in the thesis) must be revised to fit any new conditions. On the surface this statement may seem to suggest that if one element of a composition is complex, then the others must be also – yet, I am sure any adept musician or analyst can think of a number of pieces that are complex in some ways, but not in others. Instead, I suggest that if new complex compositional conditions are present, a composer must consider the impact of these conditions on all musical elements: if the relationship of such elements is an uncomfortable one, then revisions are essential if the work is to be successful. I explore this idea further in later chapters: the point here is that form, tonality, theme and rhythm are not necessarily “correlative” in Franck’s Quintet, to say the least.

From bar 470, the music remains in the tonic axis, largely in F minor and D-flat – or at least it seems to from the score. There is a great deal of chromatic alteration, particularly using German sixths and diminished and half-diminished chords. The aural effect of this, however, is an emasculation of F minor – F begins to sound like a dominant, with B-flat sounding as a potential tonic when it arrives on the downbeat of bar 520 – even D-flat begins to rival F for tonicity at bar 510. This, again, is the problem with the continuous use of the German sixth – our ears want to interpret what Franck spells as $b$II – I (such as bars 520 – 521) as $b$VI – V. The inclusion of E-flats in the final page also harmonically problematises this. The combination of this with the B-flat minor and D-flat minor chords on the strong beats of the phrases means that any sense of F (minor or major) being the tonic is essentially destroyed: a B-flat minor chord following the unison Fs at the end of
this movement would certainly not sound amiss. That said, it is possible that Franck only ended the work in F for the sake of convention. We cannot know if he really desired to experiment with progressive tonality, only surmise that such a progressive ending might have worked here.

There are two main conclusions that can be drawn from this analysis, which we may or may not consider mutually exclusive:

1) Franck was experimenting with (some sort of) progressive tonality, but for whatever reason did not see it fit to actually compose a fully progressive tonal work. Certainly, the sense of establishing one key and problematising it is at work here. Only the final step – actually ending the work in a different key to that which began it – is missing here.

2) Franck had problems integrating large-scale form with his dense chromatic harmonic language, and hence some of his mature works seem loosely organised as a result. Arguably, Franck’s use of the pc set sonically organises this work. However, the pc set does not always contribute to the functionality of the work as we might expect.

Considering pc sets for a moment, we might compare Franck’s work with a work using a similar organisational principle: Liszt’s La Lugubre Gondola No. 1. Composed only three years after Franck’s Quintet, it shares with the Quintet’s finale the idea of using tones outside the pc set to evoke functionality. (Notes outside the pc set indicated in brackets.)

Figure 6.13: Liszt, La Lugubre Gondola No. 1, bars 12 – 15

---

437 It might also be argued that this work could finish in D-flat given the emphasis that key had been given just bars before. If so this could be linked to a gesture in Beethoven’s Ninth Symphony: the closing of the exposition in B-flat (the sub-mediant) ‘shot through’ with the tonic. Here, however, that gesture is reversed.
Like the Quintet as a whole, the piece imparts a singular sonority: it and the others in the set “sound the same” – the sound-scape enabled by the pc world is specific, but flat – perfect for Liszt’s evocations of the lugubrious gondola. However, Liszt’s work is only a short one; and therefore arguably more suited to employing a pc set than a work such as the Quintet.

Whether Franck was experimenting with progressive tonality or having integrative issues with large-scale form we cannot determine from one piece alone. The next work we will consider is the String Quartet. Though it does not follow the Quintet chronologically, the two works share many features: hence, the close proximity of their analyses desirable.

Chapter Seven

String Quartet
After Beethoven a generation of composers arose who approached the String Quartet genre with “awe and superstition”\(^{438}\). Few clues survive regarding stylistic influences on many of Franck’s compositions – that is, those that Franck made direct reference to – but the String Quartet is an exception: d’Indy recounts Franck’s workbench as being “littered with the scores of Bach, Schubert and Beethoven”.\(^{439}\)

The following table illustrates the keys and main themes of the first movement.

---

**Figure 7.1: Franck, String Quartet I**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Main Theme</th>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D Major</td>
<td>Poco Lento</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 – 36</td>
<td>D minor</td>
<td>i</td>
<td></td>
<td>[35: Reh. B]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 – 40</td>
<td>‘On’ A7d</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>Reinforced by F7 (Ger6/A)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 – 50</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>‘A’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54 – 61</td>
<td>D – D minor</td>
<td>I – i</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62 – 71</td>
<td>Transition: largely an expansion of B-flat (Iβ)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72 – 80</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allegro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81 – 112</td>
<td>D minor</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>‘B’</td>
<td>[96: Reh. D]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113 – 120</td>
<td>E-flat</td>
<td>V/A-flat</td>
<td>‘C’</td>
<td>[115: Reh. E]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121 – 126</td>
<td>A-flat minor</td>
<td>WT 1 axis</td>
<td>‘C’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127 – 130</td>
<td>A-flat major/minor</td>
<td>WT 1 axis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131 – 137</td>
<td>B major</td>
<td>ivα</td>
<td></td>
<td>[131: Reh. F]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135 – 137</td>
<td>D major</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---


\(^{439}\) Ibid.
The form of the movement is novel; d’Indy describes it as a “sonata form inscribed within a Lied.” In some ways, this is similar to the slow movement-scherzo amalgam in Franck’s Symphony. Most arresting, though, is the movement’s intense chromaticism; chords with added sevenths and ninths occur frequently, as does the
German sixth chord. Such added notes have the potential to make chords sound like dominants, which at times undermine the tonicity of the movement. Within the *Lied* section the ambiguity becomes a structural impetus, the crux being whether at a given moment the D9 chord is I or V/IV. This combined with the thick chromaticism and retracting semitones, makes the movement seem emotionally charged and harmonically rich. Add to this equation unequal phrase lengths – usually three bars – and the music feels unsettled, in need of development and resolution. Perhaps this opening is less an emotional slow introduction than a motivic-harmonic roadmap, pointing the way toward the following sections.

It seems clear the Franck wanted to strike some kind of balance between problematising tonicity and “annihilating” it altogether. Cook discusses this in relation to Franck’s use of the Neapolitan chord, which arrives very early in the movement – yet earlier drafts of the *Lied* theme show that he experimented with the Neapolitan’s arrival as early as bar four. He notes that “usage of the Neapolitan is so common in the nineteenth century that it ceases to be ‘chromatic’ (read, by many, ‘complicated’) in anything but technical terms.” Cook goes on to state that the eventual placement of the E-flat in the seventh bar is a middle-way, which is strong –his opinion, however, is that it does not undermine D’s tonicity. Yet Cook does not discuss here the sixths and sevenths, which are added to the D chords that affect (and potentially undermine) the tonicity so strongly. Obviously we must also consider their effect, and I discuss this factor below.

The first *Lied* section is in mini-sonata form. Franck paints his harmonic strokes broadly, and this first section stays fairly firmly around D, despite the various problematisations discussed above. Excursions to the dominant and subdominant axes occur, and Franck places a great deal of emphasis on the Neapolitan; hence,

---

441 Robert Cameron Cook, “Transformational Approaches to Romantic Harmony and the Late Works of César Franck” (PhD Diss., University of Chicago, 2001), 121.
442 Ibid., 120.
this section might be considered a large scale \( \text{♭II} – \text{V} – \text{I} \). Any written analysis, however, does not accurately describe the effect of this section: it is emotionally intense and deeply chromatic. Chords seem to merge into one another, submerging rather than actively progressing, though this is in part due to the slow tempo. A liberal use of seventh and ninth chords is partially responsible for this submerging, as is Franck’s well-used German sixth. A great deal of the part movement is by semitone, which gives the effect (particularly at the opening) of chords contracting and retracting, not moving far from home. When sevenths invade the texture so liberally, both V and I have potential to sound like the dominant, and I7, on occasion, can sound like V of G as early as bar three. Second inversion chords are used to similar effect, as the 6/4 chord is ingrained as a dominant approach chord and is difficult to aurally interpret otherwise. I+7+9 is “problematised” – is it I or V/G? \( \text{♭VI} – \text{II} \) (and \( \text{♭II} \)) is often not allowed to resolve as we might expect (followed by V – I). Instead, Franck uses it expressively, and the tonic often simply “arrives”. Further to this, unequal phrase lengths add to the intensity. Each time the Lied theme recurs its phrasing is in three bar groupings, making it feel slightly unfinished or unsettled; conversely, the rest of the section is largely quadratic. As if to fulfill these mini-sonata form requirements, the second theme which we first heard in A major/minor is retonicised at Reh. C+6.

From the Allegro section – which begins with an unsettled theme in D minor – there is an emphasis on A-flat (a tritone away from D), which seems odd here. However, A-flat shares the tonic’s wholetone scale, and hence the overall impression is one of flatness.\(^443\) At Reh. F+7 we modulate to F (V\(\beta\)) and the second subject arrives. This does not seem unusual and fits with sonata procedures we are familiar with, yet Dahlhaus observes that we only recognise retrospectively which of the musical

\(^{443}\) This is similar to the coda of the Symphony: WT 1 axis emphasis.
thoughts constitutes the second theme, and considers the implications that this has, formally:

This is another indication of the formal problem that a string quartet movement had to solve, given the historical situation around 1880: how to integrate ‘late-romantic’ harmony, the yardstick of musical progress, without abandoning the key schemes of sonata-allegro form, to all appearances a defining feature of the genre.\footnote{Carl Dahlhaus, \textit{Nineteenth Century Music} (Berkely: University of California, 1989), 292.} Dahlhaus also notes that the music only modulates to F major (the opposing key, $V_\beta$) at the end of the exposition, and thematically consists of a “closing group”.\footnote{Ibid., 293.} Yet:

by melodic criteria, on the other hand, the actual second theme seems to be an idea that modulates from D minor through E-flat major to A-flat minor. . . thus, however much Franck wished to preserve the simple key scheme dictated by the classicist theory of sonata form, he was no less unwilling than Liszt (the source of his approach to form) to dispense with the effect of ‘wandering tonality,’ even when presenting his themes.\footnote{Ibid.}

Though Dahlhaus touches on the problematic nature of integration between form and harmony in the String Quartet, there is little evidence to suggest that Franck wished to “preserve [a] simple key scheme”: why would Franck desire this, given that chromaticism holds much harmonic potential? The link between Liszt and Franck that Dahlhaus suggests, however, is a likely one: Franck is indebted to Liszt in his use of fugue for a development section, and this further links to the chromatic idiom: “it can be shown that the fugato, as in Liszt’s . . . \textit{Prometheus}, offers a way out of the difficulty of how to write a development section when developmental techniques (chromatic modulation and sequential patterns) already predominate in the exposition.”\footnote{Ibid., 292.} Beethoven’s Op. 106 or 127 may also be likely influences here, as they additionally share with Franck’s Quartet the designation as
absolute music. I now examine other reasoning behind – and the effect of – this fugato.

The *Poco Lento* fugato arrives unannounced at Reh. H+10, and lasts for 44 bars. Though Beethoven [and perhaps others] sometimes inserted changes of tempo and meter into a quartet movement in sonata form (see for example, Beethoven’s Op. 127) these are usually only a few bars long. Both the extended slow introduction and the central *Poco Lento* suggest a reinterpretation of the slow sections’ proportions within a first movement. (It is worth noting that this use of fugue may be another link to late Beethovenian form, in that Beethoven employs fugue in both the *Hammerklavier* and Op. 131; I will discuss this further shortly.)

Of the *Poco Lento* itself, it is fugal and uses the *Lied* theme. It is in F minor (vβ) and the fugal answer in its dominant minor, C minor. There is then a modulation to B-flat minor, followed by its relative D-flat at Reh. I+11. Importantly, though, the *Poco Lento* disrupts the flow of the piece considerably. The re-ensuing *Allegro* in G minor (iv) sees a false recapitulation at Reh. K+10; the true recapitulation does not actually arrive until Reh. N+6 (see Figure 7.2).

This is preceded by a short period in the “true” dominant (A major), yet the actual arrival uses very weak voice-leading. Although the false recapitulation is less tautological than that of the Quintet’s first movement, the arrival of the recapitulation proper is not the decisive recapitulation we might desire in such a sonata form movement.
It seems that Franck undermines the tonic with a weak arrival here so that he can enunciate it later in the Quartet. However, whether this is actually the effect is another question, and will be considered below, as there is then an emphasis on tonic and subdominant axis keys until the return of the *Lied* theme at Reh. P+33, which ends the movement.

This movement brings up two questions:

1: Despite the *Allegro* sections’ adherence to the usual processes of sonata form, to what extent can we consider the movement as such, given the inclusion of the *Lied* and its effect? Considering d’Indy’s analysis of the Quartet, Cook states the following:

    The deeper issue would be one of unity, of integrity, questions which were raised in criticism of Franck’s *œuvre*, and to which d’Indy was sensitive. On one hand, if d’Indy asserts formal unity for the movement, he faces the task of explaining how the *Lied* material engages the principles of sonata form: the theme carries a great deal of weight as the piece’s cyclic motto, and yet it appears not to participate in the tonal and thematic processes proper to a sonata. Thus the theme risks violating the principles of order among elements of a composition that d’Indy cites from Ruskin.
On the other hand, his chosen course of formal separation between *Lied* and sonata elements skews the one possible option for asserting unity in the movement, namely a symmetrical interleaving of parts, because his theory of form requires a ternary structure for both designs.\textsuperscript{448}

Despite the problems this causes with d’Indy’s analytical approach, I surmise Franck was aiming for something like the “symmetrical interleaving of parts”, despite my opinion that this disrupts the flow of the movement overall. Though this process arguably blurs sonata functions, it is undeniable that the Allegro begins in F minor and arrives back in F minor at Reh. L+4. This is a significant prolongation of the dominant axis key before A arrives at Reh. M+13. Although the foreground at the point of recapitulation is $\flat\text{VI}_7\#6$, this dominant prolongation is still present: whether we sense its strength is the eventual crux of whether the movement fulfills sonata processes, and that question may not be answerable until we have considered the other movements of the Quartet.

2. We have seen in the Quintet – and again see here – that Franck has a number of chromatic devices that he is fond of using. These include liberal use of added sixths, sevenths and ninths to chords; German sixths that act as dominants rather than resolve in one of their regular ways (see Figure 7.3); and harmonic regions which he likes to emphasise, such as the Neapolitan in this movement. To a greater or lesser extent, all these gestures have the ability to affect the central tonicity. This is not a problem if a composer manages these techniques, balancing them with more tonal counterparts, or if such gestures contribute to a form that works with such a language (I am thinking specifically of Wagner here). It is not the chromaticism itself that is the problem – many of Franck’s more successful contemporaries used a deeply chromatic musical language – it is how and where the chromaticism is managed that affects our overall impression. My impression is

\textsuperscript{448}Cook, "Transformational Approaches to Romantic Harmony and the Late Works of César Franck", 115.
that this movement does not flow, and I suggest that although the form is novel, it might be that it is the gesture rather than the form that is confused; stylistically, aspects of this movement are disjointed, but it is still coherent enough to articulate its tonal plan and harmonic sonata processes.

**Figure 7.3: Franck, String Quartet, I, reh. C+20 – 21; a German sixth acting as a dominant**

(Though he does not discuss the German sixth – or the augmented sixth – acting directly in this regard, Schoenberg touches on the possibility of cadences to omit chords in “abbreviation of set patterns through omission of intermediate steps.”449)

Relating this movement to late Beethoven models, I suggest that this movement contains gestural elements of two – Op. 127 and the Hammerlavier: the first because it encapsulates tonic and subdominant emphasis, and the second because of the use of fugue. (In this it may also relate to the first movement of Op. 131.) Yet both of these elements are gestural rather than being part of a larger formal plan, as is the case in the Beethovenian forms. The emphasis on the tonic and subdominant axes in Beethoven’s Op. 127 was to avoid the dominant so that it might be posited in a

---

later movement: in Franck’s Quartet, there is a section in the dominant axis; in Beethoven’s *Hammerklavier* the fugue was employed for tonal flatness: here Franck places it in a dominant axis key. Whether Franck employs these features for their Beethovenian legacy or not is beside the point; regardless of their heritage, tonic/subdominant prolongation and fugue have defined effects, and Franck knew this. The form may be novel, but it is also problematic: an active background (axially speaking) is difficult (perhaps even impossible) to reconcile with flat foreground gestural features. Because of this, the first movement of the Quartet may have to be included in the list of “stillborn” works emulating late Beethovenian processes, however novel it may also be.

**Figure 7.4: Franck, String Quartet, II**

*Vivace*

1 – 77  
F-sharp minor  
i  
‘A’ scherzo theme  


78 – 86  
F-sharp – C minor  

[78: Reh. C]

87 – 94  
C minor – F-sharp minor  

95 – 110  
As above – instrumentation altered  

[110: Reh. D]

111 – 139  
Around F-sharp minor  

140 – 151  
F-sharp minor  

152 – 170  
Around V of D major  
V/Iβ  
Rocking idea  

[171: Reh. E]

171 – 194  
D major  
Iβ  
Rocking idea  

195 – 219  
D major  

200 – 233  
D  
Iβ  
Lied theme in cello (225)  

234 – 250  
D  
Iβ  
Repeat of 152 – 159  

251 – 270  
Transition  

271 – 387  
Recapitulation  
i  

[311: Reh. F]

388 – 415  
F-sharp major  
I  

This Scherzo lacks regular phrasing, making it feel wild and unsettled. The harmony sounds manic, but is an exemplar of the potential axial modulation gives
composers; though it feels like we are constantly modulating, we end in the same place we began. Bars 15 and 18 touch on D minor and B flat, but we return to F-sharp, the tonic, shortly after; a Schubertian chromatic prolongation of the tonic. Franck achieves a similar effect by tritone modulation, such as the modulation to C minor at Reh. C+8: because tritones split the octave exactly in half, when the process repeats the music ends where it began. Because of this, the movement gives the impression of being tonally flat. From Reh. D, Franck plunges us into a frenzied chromatic section. Meter is indistinguishable because of syncopation, and the music modulates to B-flat (Iα) in first inversion. B-flat is the flattened sixth tone of D – the next modulation – and this moment may serve to prepare us for that modulation: yet, the music has still not gone anywhere. Two-imperfect cadences then lead us back into F-sharp minor, before the music settles on F-sharp at Reh. E-20, signaling a change of mood.

From E-19 to E-1, Franck establishes V/D before we reach D at Reh. E. A rocking type theme begins, relaxed and flowing, which then develops into triple time. There are brief touches on B minor and D minor, but the music mostly remains in D major. Unlike the first movement of his Symphony, here Franck utilises the sonata principle: tonal contrast highlighted by thematic contrast. However, because the tonal contrast is within the same axis (and not as contrasting as a more remote modulation would be) the thematic contrast must be significant enough to make this impression. In order for this to be effective, thematic contrasts in this movement are acute.

At Reh. E+34 the music shifts suddenly to F-sharp minor, leading us back to D major with the Lied theme in the cello at Reh. E+54. B-flats appear in the texture, but when they turn to A-sharps in Reh. E+66 it signals the return to F-sharp minor, and the recapitulation is a carbon copy of the opening save for some pizzicato arpeggios. At Reh. F+73 the music turns to F-sharp major, recasting the rocking
theme in the new key. The movement runs out inconclusively, with Violin 1 sitting on scale degree three.

Incomplete in itself, this movement requires context for it to function the way it seems Franck intended. As outlined, he neglects the dominant axis at a background level, giving an overall impression of flatness despite the delirious energy of the themes. This continues the feeling of flatness we have sensed in the first movement, meaning the drama of the immanent and/or transcendent dominants remains unfulfilled halfway through the piece.

**Figure 7.5: Franck, String Quartet, III**

Considered in B major (IVα)

*Larghetto*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Key</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 – 33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tonal fluidity; touches on G-sharp minor, F-sharp minor, C-sharp minor and B (albeit briefly).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 – 44</td>
<td>F-sharp minor</td>
<td>v</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 – 52</td>
<td>A minor</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wholetone relative tonicised by its own bVI#6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53 – 65</td>
<td>F-sharp minor</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>[63: Reh. C]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 – 67</td>
<td>B minor</td>
<td>i</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67 – 96</td>
<td>B major</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Opening of this movement recurs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97 – 102</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Transition via diminished chord</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103 – 106</td>
<td>C major</td>
<td>IVβ</td>
<td>New theme – ‘S’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107 – 114</td>
<td>A-flat</td>
<td>IVα</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119 – 126</td>
<td>V/A-flat</td>
<td>V/IVα</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127 – 130</td>
<td>Sequence to A via B-flat minor (here acting as Neapolitan) – A-flat minor – F-sharp minor – E (V/A, WT relative and I of piece overall) – note the falling WT sequence</td>
<td></td>
<td>[127: Reh. G]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131 – 138</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>WT 1</td>
<td>‘S’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139 – 142</td>
<td>Around F – weakly</td>
<td>WT 1</td>
<td>‘S’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143 – 150</td>
<td>Sequence 146 – 149, rising in minor thirds: 148 V of B, then V of G-sharp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

202
(Key change: B major)

151 – 160  Similarly fluid, as the opening  
161 – 164  Transition to D: WTs  
165 – 172  Around V/B  
173 – 181  B  
182 – 187  B  

Similarly fluid, as the opening  

Transition to D: WTs

‘T’ as we have heard around V/A-flat

Around V/B

Fragments of first theme

Theme from bar 34. This time it appears in G-sharp minor, allowing it to resolve into the ‘right’ key (the tonic).

The first suggestion of key in this movement is G-sharp minor. However, G-sharp resolves on beat two, weakly: furthermore, the G natural in the same bar sounds like b6 in B. There is a stronger cadence on to I (B major) in bar four, followed by a cadence onto the dominant in bar eight before a confirming V – I. Though there exists potential to set up a rivalry between G-sharp and B (as tonal rivalry is a favourite technique of Franck’s) this is not the movement’s nature: instead it begins with a sense of tonal fluidity between B and its relative minor. There is then a cadence into C-sharp minor at bars 11 – 12. A new theme with iv – i harmony in C-sharp minor appears, repeated sequentially in B minor at bar 17. Following this, Franck alludes to D major and F-sharp minor from bars 21 – 23, B occurring with certainty for the first time in the movement at Reh. A+2 – 4. This first theme is reiterated, and there follows a period like a second subject in F-sharp minor.

From our analysis of the Quintet and the earlier movement of this Quartet, we know that Franck has a number of techniques he draws on for expressive emphasis: of those, what seems to predominate here is the unattainable nature of the subdominant, both in terms of B major (being IVα of the Quartet as a whole) and the subdominant axis of B major (E, G-sharp and C in this movement). Though there is an extended period in C major (IVβ), in which Franck introduces a new
theme and emphasises B’s other subdominant axis keys, the music soon transitions into A, a whole-tone related key to B and V of the Quartet as a whole. Franck also emphasises the interrupted cadence at Reh. I+21.\textsuperscript{450} The prolongation of G-sharp minor that follows (via the iv-I progression) takes on a tragic demeanor, reinforcing the true subdominant’s unattainable nature.

Furthermore, B major is only attained by a tierce de Picardie in the final bar – the only previous substantiated instances of B major being II – V – I cadences into Reh. A+5 and Reh. D\_14 - 16. The rarity of the seeming “tonic” within the piece reinforces the fragile and unsustainable quality of the subdominant, and it would be difficult indeed to find a movement in the standard repertoire where the nominal tonic is present for such a short period. Perhaps this has a programmatic purpose.

Another interpretation might be that the movement makes sense as a sonata without development (up to a point) because of the exposition’s repeat and the second theme’s lack of retonicisation in B minor. The intrusion of the Lied material delays this action and the second theme only arrives at bar 181 in the wrong key, G-sharp minor, before righting itself to B-minor/B. This upward shift of a minor third is in fact a repeat of the F-sharp minor – A minor material from Reh. F+5 (this type of tonal handling is redolent of Schubert).\textsuperscript{451} If we consider the movement a sonata form without development, the recapitulation conflates the events of Reh. B+8 – 12 tonally with what happens at Reh. C-7 – 4. As such it sounds very short-winded, as though it has tacked on a concluding gesture to one that implied, from the precedent of Reh. B+15, continuation. A further instance of Beethovenian

\textsuperscript{450} This interrupted cadence is loaded with symbolism from Beethoven’s Lebewohl sonata, Op. 81a, and it seems unlikely that contemporary audiences would have failed to make this aural connection.

\textsuperscript{451} This is similar to the way in which Schubert might have handled the material: Schubert is known for such “lazy” modulations, evidenced in works like his Fourth Symphony. See fn. 19 of Chapter Eight for more detailed information.
influence is present in the final bar of this movement. The final bar’s melody – SD 2-3-1 – is an echo of the phrasal closing gesture in bar 30 and 39 in the Cavatina of Beethoven’s Op. 130 B-flat major Quartet. As with the Lebewohl inference, this is unlikely to have been lost on contemporary audiences.

Figure 7.6: Beethoven, String Quartet Op. 130 (Cavatina) bars 38 – 39

Considering that the tonic of the work overall is D, bars 165 – 169 provide a significant foretaste of this key. Though Franck emphasises F-sharp, D remains significant, regardless of whether we feel it sounds like Vβ or III of B minor.

Figure 7.7: Franck, String Quartet, III, bars 186 – 187

Figure 7.8: Franck, String Quartet, IV

D major

*Allegro molto – and other tempi*

| 1 – 6 | F-sharp minor (also suggests F) | iα (Vα) ‘Finale’ theme |
| 7 – 11 | Around D | I | Slow movement theme |
| 12 – 24 | F-sharp minor | iα | Finale theme |
| 25 – 35 | F-sharp minor | iα | Scherzo theme |
| 36 – 52 | Transition | (as 12 – 24 ending on V/D) |
| 53 – 58 | D (with B-flat & C) | I | *Lied* theme |
| 59 – 128 | D | I | *Lied* theme, reworked (1S, b) [83: Reh. A] |
| 129 – 193 | A minor | v | Scherzo theme etc (F/D hint) [129: Reh. B] |
A major V Second subject [165: Reh. C]
C-sharp major $V_\alpha$ Second subject [209: Reh. D]
Transition $V/A - b\text{II}/D - V/A$
A minor v Using plagal voice-leading [254: Reh. E]
Moving down in WT sequences
A minor v Runs out onto G diminished

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>282 – 337</th>
<th>Key change – D-flat, Transition – D-flat, E-flat minor, E-flat, F minor (WT movement)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>338 – 359</td>
<td>Extended transition, chains of diminished chords [338: Reh. F]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>360 – 375</td>
<td>C-sharp major - minor $V_\alpha - v_\alpha$ Second subject [367: Reh. G]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>376 – 387</td>
<td>Transition using B-flat7, C-flat7, C7, B7 and C-flat7 again</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>388 – 392</td>
<td>E-flat major – minor $b\text{II} - b\text{ii}$ Reworking of Lied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>393 – 400</td>
<td>Transition through E – C-sharp – B-flat, a reversal of the progression which occurred in the first movement, through a tritone.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 400 – 439 | B-flat major – B-flat minor IV\$\beta$ - IV\$\beta$ Based on Lied [400: Reh. H] |
| 440 – 451 | Transition, mainly from diminished chords [440: Reh. I] |
| 452 – 505 | D major key signature, Transition through A (452); F-sharp major (456); E-flat major (460), then through this entire axis (G and B, comprising the subdominant axis) [476: Reh. K] |

| 470 – 476 | ‘Finale’ theme with tremolo, until we arrive at an A-sharp in bar 476 |
| 477 – 496 | On V/E-flat+9 V/IV$\beta$ |
| 497 – 505 | E minor – E-flat – D |
| 506 – 513 | D major I Lied theme |
| 514 – 529 | A-flat major – V/D-flat WT 1 |
| 530 – 546 | ‘Finale’ theme in A-flat WT 1 [530: Reh. L] |
| 547 – 559 | D major I |
| 560 – 587 | D minor i Second subject ‘fifth’ |
| 616 – 647 | D major – F-sharp major1 – I$\alpha$ Second subject |
| 661 – 700 | D minor i Second subject [685: Reh. O] |
In this movement, Franck uses the technique Beethoven employed in his Ninth Symphony: he recalls the themes from previous movements and then rejects them in favor of a new theme (though the influence of thematic reminiscence in Beethoven’s Fifth Symphony may also be important). Though cyclic thematicism and thematic transformation (as discussed in Chapter One) can play immensely significant roles in unifying a multi-movement work, the problem with Beethoven’s technique is that it appears obvious and contrived: comparison to works which use the technique (such as Beethoven’s Fifth and Ninth Symphonies) is almost inevitable. Consideration of scale is also important: though Franck’s work is large by Quartet standards, it cannot compare to Beethoven’s monumental Symphonies and even in the case of the Ninth Beethoven quotes the most recently-heard movement (the slow third movement) very briefly.

One oddity is that while a new finale idea emerges from the rubble of the previous themes; the Lied of the first movement actually comes back a second time and plays a significant role in the final movement, as does the slow movement theme. So the Beethovenian idea of “trying” ideas from each movement and rejecting them before another emerges by necessity does not seem to be the case; instead it seems a
convenient way to begin the finale dramatically, despite the return of other themes regardless.

However, once the movement proper begins at bar 59, the initial premise seems to be one of Franck’s more straightforward and diatonic movements. The first subject derives from the *Lied* theme. Reh. A+23 – 24 features one of Franck’s beloved gestures – a German sixth acting as a dominant to the tonic, D. It seems that now, with Franck using this so much, the dominant almost becomes unnecessary – we supply it mentally, as the other components of the progression are present. At Reh. B+8 we reach the dominant minor, and this constitutes one of the few occasions Franck nominates to use the actual dominant rather than an axial or some other substitute. Furthermore, A minor is actually firmly established by the length of its presence and the use of its own dominant. Reh. D-16 brings the second subject, occurring in both A major and C-sharp major (*Vα*) at IReh. D; again, we are in a very diatonic framework of applied dominants and suchlike. In many ways, this is more straightforward than other Franckian sonata form movements.

Yet despite this seemingly more straightforward nature, there are still instances where Franck’s obsession with semitonal and Neapolitan relationships shines through. One such instance is between Reh. E-19 – 27, where an E-flat chord, approached by a B-flat half-diminished in first inversion, simply rises to an E7 chord to act as applied dominant to A minor. Even though such foreground events are rarer in this movement than, say, the Quintet finale, they are still present.

A closing theme, loosely related to the second subject, signals the exposition’s end in A minor. Here the development begins with a hushed key signature change to D-flat major (*Vα*). This is the transitional material first associated with A minor, and we are still in the dominant axis. Franck states the theme in E-flat before more modulation occurs, and by Reh. F+8 we are back around A minor. This incites
further development, before the next significant tonal event: the modulation to B-flat major (Iβ) at Reh. H. This is not necessarily odd in itself, other than in the sense that the tonic axis is usually avoided in the development section, and B-flat gains quite some stability through its prolonged presence. Next, not long before the recapitulation, a very curious progression begins: at Reh. I+12 (which is also the return to a D major key signature) the music moves through a minor third progression downward, through A, F-sharp and E-flat, before reversing in the other direction by major thirds, through E-flat, G and B – the subdominant axis. Another transition then takes us to a B-flat7 chord, which is emphasised not only dynamically but also in register between Reh. K and K+17. With a sudden hush, however, B-flat turns to diminished seventh built on B, in first inversion. This in turn shifts to a half-diminished seventh on C-sharp between Reh. K+21 – 23. Yet, instead of using this sonority to resolve to D major, we move down another semitone to a C half-diminished chord, which then slips to B half-diminished at Reh. K+26, a B-flat7 at K+27, a D minor second inversion at K+28, followed by a first inversion in K+29, before the first subject is back in D major – with no sense of triumphal attainment – at Reh. K+30.

So, although the dominant axis establishes itself in this movement, there is no extended period actually in it before the return to the tonic – and Franck returns to the tonic itself in a most non-dramatic way. From here, the recapitulation continues in a very regular way, with both transitional material and the second subject recurring in the tonic, D. Further material, previously stated in the dominant, recapitulates in D minor, and we reach a natural end of these ideas at Reh. P-13, where the music begins to expire. Now, the themes from earlier in the Quartet are reintroduced: the scherzo theme at Reh. P+2 around F-sharp minor, before sinking to F minor (at Reh. P+10) in the bII – i gesture we are now so familiar with; the music then sitting with a fermata on a D-sharp diminished seventh at Reh P+17.
This then resolves to A major in the next bar, before the theme from the scherzo turns the music to A minor again. Throughout this time, there are multiple rest bars and points at which only one instrument holds a note. This creates a sense of unrest: the music’s direction becomes difficult to pinpoint.

However, a firmer section begins at Reh. Q, where the Scherzo theme becomes an accompaniment figure to the first subject in the minor mode. Initially around A minor, the 10-bar phrase repeats in D minor, before a sudden shift to somewhere between D major and a D augmented chord between Reh. R and R+7, which is followed by an anguished return of the slow movement theme at Reh. R+8. Though around B minor, the key is not certain, and becomes even more distraught on its repeat in D minor at Reh. S+2. This runs out onto an emphasised dominant seventh chord of A (on most previous occasions departed by semitone – for example, Reh. N+10, E-18), which, this time, shifts to a C-sharp major chord (V/Iα) instead. With the Lied theme being developed in the upper parts, this subtly changes to a E-sharp diminished chord at Reh. S+50; this simply “falls” to an E-minor half-diminished, then E-flat7, which leads us back to D major with the Lied theme ending the piece (with added G-sharps and B-flats, but the tonicity not in doubt).

I find this movement rather convincing up until the coda, which is problematic. Here Franck has generally used axial tonality in its useful, regular way (stabilising chromaticism in areas where we might expect it) but in the coda, where we would expect some stability, he continues to modulate in a non-axial (tonally active) way; he has effectively continued modulating without cause, which results in structural failure. At P-13 the music seems to be drawing to a close, yet Franck tries to start it up again, seemingly unsuccessfully. I suggest that the inadequacy one feels here is linked to the structure of the Quartet as a whole, and the problem of the finale.
The success of the finales in late Beethoven (particularly the chamber works and Op. 106) seems to lie in the way Beethoven leaves some vital task for the finale to enact.\textsuperscript{452} In Op. 127, 106 and 131, this critical task is the more vital sonata tonicisation which only occurs in the final movement. Drama in the finale can be brought about in other ways, however, if something in procedure or content is new: this is why Lewis states that the finales of Beethoven’s Third (double variation form) and Fifth Symphonies (cyclicism and progressive modality) and Brahms’ Fourth (Passacaglia in which “duality is implicit”) are so successful; the use of Fugue (Beethoven’s Große Fuge or the Hammerklavier finale) and the emergence of melody which changes everything (Beethoven’s Ninth Symphony) may arguably also subscribe to this theory.\textsuperscript{453} However, it is no surprise that Franck’s Quartet suffers from the problem of the finale: despite its formal novelty, the first movement is a tonicising sonata form. Though it is necessary to retonicise D after the key scheme of the central movements, using a regular sonata form for the finale still sounds tautological: the first movement confirms D beyond doubt. Franck’s finale lacks conditions of “implicit duality” or new procedure or content, which is why from Reh. P-13 in the finale it seems so repetitive. The first movement’s conventional tonal layout effectively works against the novelty of its form; Franck has imitated Beethoven in gesture, but not emulated the background that necessitates those same gestures. Though I surmise Franck recalls these themes to promote thematic unity, the overall effect actually undermines the flow of the coda to my ears. Perhaps it would have been possible to use these themes less ostentatiously and more fluidly; had this been the case, perhaps then the coda would not seem so problematic.

\textsuperscript{452} It might be argued that Brahms’ Third Symphony and Piano Quintet do indeed leave this vital task until the final movement.

The other issue, of course, is one of proportion. The first movement of Franck’s Quartet is 373 bars long – lengthy considering the Lento tempo of much of the material. To illustrate this, compare the timings of recordings by the Ortiz Fine Arts Quartet (a), and the Academia String Quartet (b) – both recordings available on Naxos Music Library.

**Figure 7.8: Comparison of recordings**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Movement</th>
<th>(a)</th>
<th>(b)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I: Lento: Allegro</td>
<td>13.46</td>
<td>16.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II: Vivace</td>
<td>5.27</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III: Larghetto</td>
<td>10.19</td>
<td>13.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV: Allegro molto</td>
<td>14.02</td>
<td>13.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This means that Franck will want to balance the proportions of the first movement with the others, which he does; but this only becomes a problem in the finale, where – by Reh. P-13 – the music seems to be repeating itself. As the first movement’s length necessitates the length of the finale, this is similar to the situation Kerman writes about regarding Beethoven’s String Quartet Op. 59 No. 1. To re-quote Kerman, Beethoven struggled specifically with the problem of the finale in some movements, including the finale of this quartet: “so exhaustive an experience has been conveyed [in the first movement] and in so many facets, as to make any further communication superfluous . . . the later movements are set awkwardly for the total impression.”

Arguably, this is what has happened in Franck’s Quartet – the first movement’s size and tonal articulation cannot be matched in and by the finale. Dahlhaus’ assessment of the String Quartet is particularly apt here:

---

It was no easy matter to balance simplicity and lucidity of form . . . with the harmonic complexities that even composers with conservative instincts felt compelled by the zeitgeist to adopt . . . Just how difficult this could be is illustrated by Franck’s D-major String Quartet (1889) with a charity characteristic of major works of art, part of whose nature it is to make problems manifest rather than concealing them in artifices, a sure sign of mediocrity.455

Though beautiful moments abound, the problems here are certainly manifest. The same might be said of Franck’s Symphony in D minor, which I analyse next.

---

Much is written about the Symphony and its first performances, and it is worth surveying these views prior to the analysis to deduce the criticisms leveled at the music. Franck wanted the conductor Lamoureux to give the premiere, but, disliking Franck’s music, Lamoureux suggested taking the Symphony to the Société des Concerts du Conservatoire instead. It was accepted, but – if d’Indy is a reliable source – the orchestra hated it, and it was only at the insistence of conductor Jules Garcin that the premiere took place on February 17, 1889. Contemporary reaction was mixed: “only four or five of us [Franck’s pupils] were able to slip in”, writes Pierre de Bréville. “[We] were almost alone in applauding, and even that greatly scandalized our neighbours.” Romain Rolland was present at the premiere, and his diary recounts:

An organ style. A regular development, powerful, stiff. Phrases chopped up harshly, shouted out by the brass. Dryness at times. Brusque passages without transitions, from fff to ppp (as in the Béatitudes.) But there is grandeur, emotion, thoughts that recall the Béatitudes. A personality. In the hall, three audiences: frenzied applause – very few; more numerous – “Hush! Hush!” (They are normally rare at the Conservatoire.) These calls came mostly from the front boxes. During the performance, I saw some listeners pretending to stop up their ears. Finally, the mass of the public, indifferent.

The aspects Rolland has noted are relevant; some critics took exception to the repetitive four-bar phrases, cyclic thematicism, and the thick instrumentation.

---

457 Ibid., 608.
Contemporary commentators also criticised the use of the Cor Anglais in the middle movement, despite Berlioz having incorporated it in the *Symphonie Fantastique* years earlier, as well as d’Indy and Haydn employing it in Symphonies.\(^{458}\) Boutarel reviewed the Lamoureux performance and found Franck’s work problematic: as Cook summarises, “the piece ponderously bludgeons the listener with very little, and uninteresting material. We can imagine that the return of the slow, unison opening in F minor bores Boutarel, seeming to him like a repetitive sermon or catechism lesson. ‘Why not fresh music for the new key’? he wonders.”\(^{459}\)

Furthermore, Franck’s Symphony has attracted criticism for its tonal discursiveness. Yet we must examine the work to see whether the tonal discursiveness is oppositional – and therefore of structural importance – or merely fanciful modulation. Axial analysis can help to reveal this. We have already seen how Franck has used axial tonality in his earlier works, and the Symphony is no exception; in the first movement, it seems that Franck establishes D minor as the initial tonality; threatens it with F minor, the Beta axial dominant; then “rescues” D minor. D’Indy states that Franck conceived of the Symphony this way: “a struggle between the opposing ‘tonal poles’ of D and F, culminating in the victory of the former; all the important harmonic areas relate to one of these ‘poles’”.\(^{460}\) Whether this technique is effective and how axial tonality might be involved depends largely on the crafting of large scale form, which we will examine shortly.

Before I examine the Symphony’s tonal relationships, it is pertinent to mention several features of the first movement. The first of these is the multiple fermatas

---

\(^{458}\) Ibid., 608n.

\(^{459}\) Robert Cameron Cook, “Transformational Approaches to Romantic Harmony and the Late Works of César Franck” (PhD Diss., University of Chicago, 2001), 138.

\(^{460}\) Brown and Hart, *The Symphonic Repertoire Volume III Part B: The European Symphony from ca. 1800 to ca. 1930: Great Britain, Russia, and France*, 593.
and changes in tempo between *Lento* and *Allegro*. This aggravates many critics, and is likely one of the problems Boutarel is alluding to in the above quote. Tovey complained that Franck’s pace was (by this point, late in his life) “becoming Wagnerian.” Yet pauses do draw attention to structural peculiarities, the most important being the complete and literal repetition of the first part of the exposition in F minor (vβ), which also sees the return to the opening slow tempo of the movement. Norman Demuth argues that the success of such pauses in Franck’s Symphony depends on how a conductor shapes the work, suggesting that:

[the Symphony’s] discursive moments are rarely free from interruption and argument [and] lead very often to nothing. There is a lot of questioning and answering . . . These points are emphasised by nearly every conductor who essays the work. It is the happy hunting ground of the ‘tempo-rubato’ conductor who cannot by any means be persuaded to play the music as the composer wrote it. He exaggerates everything and the work is never allowed to get a move on. Such pauses are a feature of Franck’s late style, and some may interpret them as the organist-composer changing manuals or shifting stops, but such labels veil the problem: such pauses are rarely as effective in orchestral works as they might be between the organ’s Swell and Great manuals in *St. Sulpice*. Fermatas in the *Trois Chorals* give the music breath; in the Symphony, they seem to stifle the music’s progress. We must not discount, however, the possibility that this was Franck’s intention, and if so it is most likely intended to draw attention to specific features.

The opening motif – *Mus es stein?* – was used by Beethoven in the F Major String Quartet Op. 135, Liszt in *Les Préludes*, and Wagner in *Die Walküre*. It is not known whether Franck intended any extra-musical reference, but to conjure Beethoven, Liszt and Wagner in one musical breath might be considered reverential given not

---

462 Norman Demuth, *César Franck* (London: Dennis Dobson Ltd., 1949), 84 - 86.
463 Demuth, *César Franck*, 80.
only that this is Franck’s only Symphony but also the importance placed on the symphonic genre in the late nineteenth century. As Dahlhaus writes, the Symphony developed new significance after Beethoven:

The task that composers faced in assimilating the Beethoven legacy had to do with a will to large-scale form. Beethoven had transformed the symphony into a monumental genre . . . thereafter, a symphony manifested compositional ambitions of the highest order, the audience it addressed being no smaller than the whole of humanity.\textsuperscript{464}

It is extremely likely that this “anxiety of influence” had an effect on Franck and his contemporaries. The following table shows the keys used in the first movement.

\textbf{Figure 8.1: Franck, Symphony in D minor, I}

\begin{tabular}{|l|l|l|l|}
\hline
 &  &  &  \\
\hline
 &  &  &  \\
\hline
D minor  &  &  &  \\
\hline
\textit{Lento}  &  &  &  \\
\hline
1 – 12  & D minor/G minor  & i - iv  &  \\
\hline
\hline
21 – 24  & F-sharp minor – B minor  & iα – ivα  &  \\
\hline
25 – 28  & Bass movement: through B-flat and C to D to V/D  & Wholetone movement  &  \\
\hline
\textit{Allegro non troppo}  &  &  &  \\
\hline
29 – 38  & D minor  & i  &  \\
\hline
39 – 46  & D minor/G minor  & i – iv  &  \\
\hline
\hline
47 – 48  & V/C – C (as V/F)\textsuperscript{β} is Vβ  &  & [47: Reh. B]  \\
\hline
\textit{Lento}  &  &  &  \\
\hline
49 – 76  & F minor  & \textsuperscript{vβ}  & [61: Reh. C]  \\
\hline
\textit{Allegro non troppo}  &  &  &  \\
\hline
77 – 94  & F minor  & \textsuperscript{vβ}  & [91: Reh. D]  \\
\hline
95 – 110  & F major  & Vβ  &  \\
\hline
\hline
117 – 120  & E-flat major  & IVβ & WT to D-flat/F  \\
\hline
121 – 124  & Transition to F (as 117 – 118)  &  &  \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\textsuperscript{464} Carl Dahlhaus, \textit{Nineteenth Century Music} (Berkley: University of California, 1989), 152.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Key</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Transition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>125 – 145</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Vβ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161 – 170</td>
<td>Transition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171 – 178</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Vβ</td>
<td>[171: Reh. G]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above box represents the only significant instances of V in this movement

179 – 186 D minor – major i – I WT 1
187 – 190 B major IVα WT 2

Development

191 – 205 A-flat minor WT WT 1 [195: Reh. H]
206 – 209 C-flat/B (spelled as both) ivα WT 2
210 – 212 B minor ivα
213 – 220 D I WT 1 [213: Reh. I]
221 – 226 Transition to A-flat, resolving like a German sixth
227 – 234 A-flat major WT WT 1
249 – 259 A-flat – F-sharp minor – E All WT 1
260 – 266 E – D – C minor All WT 1
267 – 274 To C minor in 272 v/Vβ [267: Reh. L]
275 – 280 To E minor in 279 v/V
281 – 293 G minor - B-flat7 – C-sharp7 iv – V/♭II – V/Iα
293 – 300 E V/V WT 1 [296: Reh. M]
301 – 306 A-flat – C Vα WT 1
323 – 330 Diminished – V/D

Lento

331 – 345 D minor – B minor i – ivα
345 – 348 WT transition: B minor – C-sharp minor – E-flat minor – then V/E-flat minor

Allegro

349 – 360 E-flat minor [349: Reh. O]
361 – 374 G minor, with D pedal iv [370: Reh. P]
375 – 380 E-flat (briefly) then to V/D bVI/iv – V/I
381 – 384 D I
The harmony of the opening phrase could be interpreted as either G minor or D minor, creating a subdominant bias right from the beginning. This is significant because – if Franck intends to create a rival tonicity before rescuing the “true” tonic – he must establish tonal ambiguity from the outset. (Though F minor becomes the true rival tonicity, G minor casts the initial shadow; hence, D minor is not established unequivocally.) Franck also uses the German sixth a great deal, as we have already seen: in many of his late works, he uses German sixths as remote modulatory devices. Bar eight is such an instance: a dominant seventh on A (implying V/D) is resolved as though it were a German sixth into a D-flat major chord in first inversion. D-flat and C-flat (both of which follow in bar nine) belong to the same whole tone scale as G. This may reinforce G’s claim of tonicity, or at least underline the oppositional nature of its whole tone scale. Reh. A+9 – 11 illustrates a similar tactic, but this time within the whole tone scale of D through G-flat – A-flat – B-flat (in first inversion then root position). Semitonal movement breaks this whole tone movement to the dominant before the tempo change to Allegro non troppo. As it is difficult to define a key in whole tones alone, it is little wonder that the impression of this opening section is one of inaction.
Conversely, the rhythmic and harmonic action begins with an increase in tempo at the *Allegro non troppo*. At Reh. A+17, Franck employs a new double dotted motif, an “intervallic compression” of the main theme. This theme also makes use of the [0, 1, 4, 5, 8, 9] row of the Quintet, with the theme comprising 0-1-8-9, which might build a case for a D/B-flat polarity; whether this eventuates remains to be seen. No sooner has this music begun, however, when E-flats appear (Reh. B-8). Though fleeting, this haven of E-flat – another subdominant axis member, harking back to the introduction – undermines D’s claim to tonicity, and the C-flats and A-flats in the texture reinforce plagal voice leading.\(^\text{465}\) The music reflects back on D before quickly modulating to C major (V/F minor or Vβ) and the section runs out with a *molto rall*.

At Reh. B+2 we are presented with another *Lento* section, repeating the opening material in F minor (vβ). Critics debate the purpose and effect of this stark break fiercely. Tovey, having compared Franck’s stop-start tempo tactics to Beethoven’s String Quartet Op. 130, feels such a repeat is an anticlimax: “No wonder critics are disappointed who expect anything like the athletic movement of Beethoven’s Op. 130. Franck’s drastic simplicity belongs to quite another view of the universe.”\(^\text{466}\) Demuth,\(^\text{467}\) however, is more defensive, quoting Guy Ropartz’s assertion that “the movement proper is in the nature of a ‘double’,,” and later pronouncing the movement as “very satisfying.”\(^\text{468}\) Earlier criticism aside, this technique is unarguably conspicuous and assumes a lack of sensibility on the audience’s part. What could be less subtle than a complete repetition of the opening material in a new key? Furthermore, this section presents potential tonal problems: the work’s opening phrases indicated a subdominant bias, but Franck has set this section in

\(^{465}\) This plagal voice leading is similar to the flat-6 flat-7 major mode that is found in Brahms, Tchaikovsky and Rachmaninov.
\(^{466}\) Tovey, *Essays in Musical Analysis Volume I: Symphonies*, 63.
\(^{467}\) Demuth, *César Franck*.
\(^{468}\) Ibid., 81.
the mediant minor, $v\beta$. This is problematic because of the lack of sonata principle: tonal contrast highlighted by thematic contrast. The movement only attains thematic contrast at Reh. D+9, when the second subject coincides with a change of mode to F major. The lack of such contrast before this point only makes the opening seem tautological retrospectively.

Nevertheless, the second subject does fulfill traditional expectations. It is in F major, an axially related key to the dominant, and has a lyrical nature. At Reh. E there is a modulation to D-flat major ($V\alpha$), from which wholetone movement ensues and we modulate through E-flat to reach F at Reh. E+14. At Reh. E+18 there is a new melodic idea in F – with the nature of a closing theme – and includes a reference to $V/D$-flat in Reh. E+23. This new idea is then repeated in each dominant axis key (F, A and C-sharp) at letter F through F+15; a similar way to how Schubert presents such material.\footnote{For a discussion of how Schubert utilises the entire dominant axis in a development, see Cohn, “As Wonderful As Star Clusters: Instruments For Gazing At Tonality In Schubert”, 225.} The modulation presents an interesting paradox: though this theme is four-square and shaped as a closing theme (as we might expect at this point in a classical sonata form work), Franck continues to modulate within the dominant axis. In other words, despite signaling the close of the exposition melodically, Franck continues to “enrich the fundamental bass” harmonically by maintaining axial fluctuation.\footnote{Carl Dahlhaus, \textit{Between Romanticism and Modernism: Four Studies in the Music of the Later Nineteenth Century} (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1980), 63.} Modulation within a first or second subject area is not unusual, but the important aspect is \textit{where} Franck is modulating in terms of the overall sonata scheme. Where other composers might choose tonal stasis (such as this point in the exposition of Liszt’s B minor Sonata) Franck chooses to forego such stasis, despite the theme being a closing one in nature. If we compare this with Schubert’s String Quartet in G major (D887), it is notable that although all dominant axis members are used in the exposition, there is a definite stable period
in D (V) from bars 142 – 169.\footnote{Downes, "An Axial System of Tonality Applied to Progressive Tonality in the Works of Gustav Mahler and Nineteenth Century Antecedents", 31.} This is coupled with a rhythmically stable theme. In contrast, one might surmise that Franck either has another scheme in mind, or does not know what he is doing.

As the section closes, there is another harmonic surprise at Reh. G+8, with the sudden reappearance of D. Considering the development section is imminent, D is an unusual choice.\footnote{However, this is not without precedent – Brahms used a similar technique in his fourth Symphony. In Brahms’ work, however, the return of the tonic implies a literal repeat of the exposition, thwarted by the onset of the development section instead. Brahms’ fourth Symphony pre-dates Franck’s in both performance and publication, and thus could have influenced Franck’s Symphony.} Nevertheless, the closing-type motif in the first movement of Franck’s Symphony recurs in D and B major before the development proper begins, with the same motif occurring in A-flat minor at Reh. G+20. In the development, members of the subdominant axis provide tonal contrast, as well as those keys that share the tonic’s wholetone scale; Franck avoids the dominant axis. Hence, the next key area is C-flat – enharmonically B and IVα – but the real surprise is the return of D major at Reh. I. This emphasis on the tonic major seems tautological and is quite literally unprecedented: why would Franck choose to restate the tonic in the development section? Perhaps he considered it would sound like a mediant given the prior B minor context, but would this not undermine the impact of the tonic return at the recapitulation? The effect, however, is not what one might expect; this period in D major sounds less like a premature return and more like an exotic modulation. Franck has achieved this effect through his double exposition of D and F minor. By casting doubt over the “true” tonic, the return of D makes F minor seem like a tonal usurpation, aurally comparable to IVα of F minor rather than I. In this we sense the late Beethoven tactic of making the tonic vulnerable in order to rescue it, as discussed in the “proto-progressive model” in Chapter Four. (Further discussion follows in the next
Chapter.) The success of such a scheme will depend on whether the remainder of the Symphony logically follows the path of this agent and how Franck “composes it out”. The contrast between background and foreground key areas is also notable. So far, the larger tonal scheme has traversed D, F and A-flat minors, whilst foreground modulations have included D, B, and A-flat. These keys are mirror images of one another. This emphasis on A-flat (IIα) is extended in the finale, where the supertonic axis becomes a significant key area.

Sequential material follows this excursion to D major, emphasising F’s dominant axis. At Reh. K-10 a D-flat7 resolves like a German sixth into A-flat major (Vβ in F). A wholetone sequence then moves through A-flat and F-sharp minor, before cadencing onto E at Reh. K+20 (again, possibly prefiguring the emphasis on the supertonic axis in the finale). This sequence repeats, moving down from E to D and cadencing in C at Reh. K+24. Following this, an extension of C minor occurs; a major third sequence through A-flat, E and C, before a shift to E minor at Reh. K+34. There is a brief return to G minor, moving to B-flat, before an arrival in E major at Reh. M-7.

Though the keys of A-flat-C-E form an axis of their own, to describe them as the “supertonic” axis here is to misconstrue their function (unlike in the String Quartet – see Chapter Seven). Combined with the emphasis on F-sharp and D as key areas, the vast majority of the development centers on the tonic wholetone scale, as illustrated by Figure 8.1. With all this wholetone activity a key lacks definition, making the interpretation of this section as development of D problematic. A more accurate interpretation might be that this modulation is preparing a tonic return of F minor rather than D.473 After all, A-flat C and E – predominant tonal areas within

---

473 It is tempting to draw a parallel here with Mahler’s first Symphony, as it shares with Franck’s the opposition of F and D minors. However, though I argue that Franck is on the cusp of progressive tonality (indeed, this is why I have chosen the term “proto-progressive
the development – constitute F’s dominant axis. Franck’s emphasising on keys related to D’s whole-tone scale points to deliberate planning on his part, though whether this is able to balance with the rest of the Symphony is yet to emerge.

From Reh. M-7, the harmony implies even more axial relationships: E acts as a springboard for the reiteration of F’s dominant axis. A thick tutti passage follows, harmonically situated around V/D (though diminished in nature). This leads to a fully diminished C-sharp dim7 at Reh. N+3, before D minor returns at Reh. N+14 in the opening Lento tempo. Franck gives this return full tutti force, but by now we are so well prepared for F minor that D minor is not entirely persuasive, and the C-sharp dim7 chord at Reh. N+3 could have resolved to either D or F minor. This chromaticism destroys any sense of clear tonal direction, aided by the ambivalence of D as the true tonic and F’s role as tonal hijacker. There is a single glance at D major and B minor (ivα) before reaching E-flat minor (ivβ). E-flat minor takes the form of the opening Allegro, on the flat side, before a dynamic withdrawal of forces and axial modulation to G minor in which Franck cunningly uses a dominant pedal of D to reiterate the tonic whilst in the key of the subdominant. The re-casting in E-flat minor is pivotal for the recapitulation to function assertively. By placing the Allegro theme in a subdominant relative key (ivβ), Franck forces the listener to hear it as a counterweight to the original key of F minor: vβ effectively neutralised by ivβ.474

Reh. P+5 sees a brief flirtation with E-flat major before dominant preparation begins and D reappears at Reh. P+11; however, B-flat (Iβ) is the chosen key for the restatement of the second subject at Reh. Q+12. It is arguably here that the tonic is neutralised by the dominant pedal of D.475

footnote: 474 Schubert is known to use a similar scheme to modulate in some works, including his Fourth Symphony, the first movement of which (in C) modulates through C to A-flat in the exposition and then G to E-flat in the recapitulation (sequences notwithstanding).
“rescued”: tonicity becomes stable, with the second subject reassuringly unaffected. There is some whole-tone modulation in the tonic axis before a significant arrival at Reh. T-12, where the music from the beginning of the development section is restated, echoing the earlier register and orchestration, but properly enunciated as the tonic. This arrival builds on the work of the second subject in happily confirming D.

The music remains around D/B-flat for the remainder of the movement, but the final Lento reemphasises the subdominant area by returning to G minor one final time. The final cadence also uses a type of German sixth chord instead of V: a romantic touch, but passive in a tonal sense. The infiltration of E-flats suggests a dominant function for D – possibly a dominant minor ninth – before D is “rescued” one final time. From this gesture we can hear that the Symphony’s opening ruse of problematising D minor with its subdominant continues, even in the movement’s final bars. Despite the dramatisation, though, the deeper tonicisation processes mean that F sounds suitably rejected and D appropriately affirmed.

Examining Cook’s analysis reinforces many of the ideas we have explored in this movement. He explores this movement in detail, and the crux of his discussion revolves around the role of the double exposition. He questions:

Does the F-minor repetition of the opening theme ask more of the material than it can deliver, forestalling desired thematic development and hanging a numb, useless limb on an otherwise vigorous torso? [For the critics], the piece makes an incoherent thematic argument, rendering the formal structure disjointed. In contrast, [Franck’s apologists] take the logic of thematic relationships for granted: the demands of form justify the repetition of the first theme.

---

475Cook, "Transformational Approaches to Romantic Harmony and the Late Works of César Franck", 134.
Here Cook’s analysis aligns with my identification regarding the lack of sonata principle. Without delving too deeply into his techniques, it is possible to state that Cook shares with our analysis a discomfort in form here, both agreeing (in some ways) with the original critics, whilst seeking to understand the deeper procedures at play in this movement. Predominantly, it is the severing of thematic and tonal relationships – previously so intrinsically bound – that Cook identifies as perturbing for the Symphony’s first critics:

they expected a strict tonal hierarchy – it is not the chromaticism itself that offended, but its apparent incoherence – that would organise the themes and their transformations into a coherent narrative. Instead, Franck’s disconcerting, rapid chromatic progressions left even sympathetic commentators searching for some principle with which to order the thematic material and justify its formal disposition.  

Cook’s final assessment of the movement (he does not consider the other movements of the Symphony) is that “the dialectical disposition of thematic material is a map, a grid, through which we interpret the chromatic tonal process as the developing, affect-bearing layer of the listening experience.” In some ways this assessment is unproblematic; it largely seems to fit with my analysis. With the nature of nineteenth-century form, though, it seems likely to me that Franck intended this work to be heard in its three movements, and furthermore, that the movements constitute – on some level – a larger structure that informs our perceptions of the Symphony. Therefore, whilst each movement should be considered separately, they should also be considered as one part of a larger whole. Though Cook’s experiences through the “tonal map” are indeed a legitimate experience of the processes of this movement, axial tonality invites us to examine harmonic unity at a larger level, both within and between movements. Given this, let us now consider the second movement.

476 Ibid., 159.
477 Ibid., 168 - 69.
Second Movement

In contemporary reviews of Franck’s Symphony, this movement is the least criticised of the three: “the oasis in this desert” as Camille Bellaigue called it.\(^{478}\) In a novel twist of form, here Franck telescopes the Scherzo inside an otherwise regular slow movement. The outer sections feature a Cor Anglais solo, a point of contention for Franck’s critics; some of them thought its inclusion put the work outside the genre of the Symphony.\(^{479}\) The Scherzo section, from Reh F – O+3, is similar in nature to Berlioz’ “Queen Mab” Scherzo from *Roméo et Juliette*, a possible influence. Franz Berwald also uses the overall A–B–A / Slow–Scherzo–Slow form in his *Symphonie singulière*, composed in 1845.\(^{480}\) Regardless of other possible precedents, this *Allegretto* remains one of the most innovative experiments in telescoping two movements for inclusion within a tripartite Symphonic framework.

Figure 8.2: Franck, Symphony in D minor, II

B-flat minor

*Allegretto* ‘Slow movement’

| 1 – 40 | B-flat minor; D-flat (V♭) 13 – 14 | i | 16: Reh. A; 39: Reh. B |
| 41 – 48 | Suggests D-flat, then B-flat major | V♭ – I | 48: Reh. C |
| 48 – 56 | B-flat major | I | |
| 57 – 61 | V/C-flat – C-flat major | WT2 | |
| 62 – 69 | Toward B-flat minor - E♭#6 at 68 to G minor | i – ivα | 64: Reh. D |
| 69 – 86 | Through D-flat minor (v♭, 70 – 71); then a chain of diminished chords built on G and A-flat. V7♭ – i (G minor) in 78 – 79, before a re-transition to B-flat by bar 86. | | |
| 87 – 90 | B-flat minor | i | Reprise of opening |
| 91 – 94 | B-flat – D major | i – iα | |
| 94 – 96 | D major | V/ivα | |

\(^{478}\) Brown and Hart, *The Symphonic Repertoire Volume III Part B: The European Symphony from ca. 1800 to ca. 1930: Great Britain, Russia, and France*, 600.

\(^{479}\) Ibid., 608.

\(^{480}\) Ibid., 600.
‘Scherzo’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bar Range</th>
<th>Musical Event</th>
<th>Key Signature</th>
<th>Rehearsal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>96 – 108</td>
<td>Transition – G minor cadence at 104</td>
<td>ivα</td>
<td>[96: Reh. F]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135 – 142</td>
<td>E-flat major</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151 – 175</td>
<td>E-flat area</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>[159: Reh. L; 174: Reh. M]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176 – 183</td>
<td>G minor</td>
<td>ivα</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>184 – 199</td>
<td>G minor – C minor</td>
<td>ivα – WT 1</td>
<td>[194: Reh. N]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200 – 221</td>
<td>B-flat minor</td>
<td></td>
<td>[218: Reh. O]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Almost all in the subdominant axis

‘Slow movement’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bar Range</th>
<th>Musical Event</th>
<th>Key Signature</th>
<th>Rehearsal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>222 – 233</td>
<td>B major</td>
<td>bII (or IVβ)</td>
<td>[229: Reh. P]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>234 – 248</td>
<td>Transition: sounds like a D major arrival at 245 – 248; this could possibly be aurally interpreted as a flirtation with V/G minor – more subdominant bias.</td>
<td></td>
<td>[236: Reh. Q]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>249 – 262</td>
<td>B-flat</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first sixteen bars show a tendency toward flat keys; V7 and vii of IV are both implied in bar five. As well as flat bias there is a mirroring of the first movement key scheme in the use of vα (and Vα) or iii and III. This begins at Reh. A-2, reinforced by vi (G-flat minor), which acts as a plagal toniciser of D-flat in bars A-3 – 2 and Reh. B-2 – 1. This tonal emphasis might be linked to the dual slow movement/scherzo function of this movement, as elements of parody frequently occur in Scherzo movements, and the B-flat minor – D-flat minor relationship could be interpreted as a mirror of the D minor – F minor relationship so prevalent in the first movement. Franck reinforces this mirroring of tonal processes further by modulating to B-flat major with a new theme at Reh. C-1; this same shift occurred when we heard the second subject in the first movement.

481 It seems that the f-A a-F opposition in the Quintet (that reinforced a relational coherence across movements in a tonal sense) was a preoccupation of Franck’s.
Fragmented themes are developed, working through C-flat (IVβ) and G minor (iva) before a digression to G-flat at Reh. D+5. This might be a composing out of the G-flat heard briefly in the opening harmony, but it is momentary as the music moves through G minor at Reh. E+2 before returning to B-flat. We hear the first four bars of the Cor Anglais melody before we reach a familiar Franck-style fermata. The next four bars belong to the horn, generating an axial shift to D minor. The upper woodwinds then induce the semitonal shift from F to F-sharp, and the music rests on D major with another fermata at Reh. F. Therefore, although Franck employs a representative of the dominant axis, the ongoing emphasis is on the tonic and subdominant axis keys.

The Scherzo begins scurrilously, with urgent triplets in the violins outlining G minor. This opening sounds like accompaniment with the solo missing, as it uses the harmonic outline of the Cor Anglais theme without the melody itself. The music cadences onto G minor at Reh. F+8, while other harmonic inflections are similarly parodistic: a touch on E-flat (iβ in G minor); a sudden shift from V/G minor to B-flat (III or Vβ/G minor) then D minor (v); and a plagal reinforcement of B-flat major between Reh. H+4 – 5. A shift to E-flat major occurs at Reh. I+2 alongside the first instance of dotted rhythms in this movement. Franck emphasises the chord of C-flat (♭VI in E-flat) and in Reh. I+8 reinterpreted as B natural in the progression III – V – I in E-flat. (This may be an echo of the earlier “miraculous” modulation at Reh. C-1 with its tierce de Picardie effect: III – V – I in B-flat minor/major.) The music remains around E-flat and G minor until an odd progression: from Reh. N-2 we progress through C minor, E-flat6/4, B76/4/2, A (with G-sharp min7 acting as dominant), then C-flat alternating with B-flat. The music sounds as though it is building to E-flat through German sixth and dominant preparation, so when the Cor Anglais tune begins in B-flat minor at Reh. N+6 it seems rather odd, particularly as there is a iv – i inflection in B-flat major in the
previous bar. Like the early emphasis on the dominant in the first movement, subdominant axis keys permeate the Scherzo so strongly that B-flat begins to sound like V of E-flat; hence, when B-flat returns with the main theme at Reh. N+6 it virtually sounds as though it is in the dominant. This is similar to one of the harmonic idiosyncrasies of the Quintet: the Neapolitan is used as an approach chord to I, which has the effect of sounding like $\flat$VI of IV.

From Reh. N+6 the Cor Anglais melody reappears but the triplets in the violins remain; melodically, we are in slow movement territory while retaining a Scherzo articulation. This remains a literal reprise until a shift to B major (IVα) at Reh. O+4. It is possible that the unusual harmonic events of Reh. F-3 were a foreshadowing of this modulation, and also possible that this section is parodying the E-flat minor – D minor relationship of the first movement, a hypothesis which is strengthened by musical geography, as in both movements the modulation to IVα occurs near the end.

The slow movement returns, texturally speaking, at Reh. Q-2, with a reconfirmation of the tonic after all the subdominant emphasis. From the B major discussed above (IVβ), there is a shift to its dominant, F-sharp major (Iβ of this movement). There follows a short transition (where B is respelled as C-flat) until a cadence into D major at Reh. Q+11, confirming the tonic axis. We might interpret this as further emphasis on III. From D it is only a short distance (tonally speaking) to B-flat, confirmed by a cadence at Reh. Q+23. It is also significant that the final cadence is iv7 – I; only one semitone different from a German sixth built on E-flat, but with a much more passive effect; the voice-leading of IV7 or iv7 is almost identical to a German Sixth in that the notated $\flat$7 actually resolves upward like an augmented sixth.
Subdominant emphasis saturates this movement; it permeates foreground middleground and background. Such an effect gives a relaxed “inactive” feel to the movement, and sufficiently avoids emphasis of the dominant and dominant axis. We might also consider the movement parodistic at some level – certainly the scurrying triplets and the imitation of earlier harmonic events lend this feeling – but a better description might be “reflective”, as this movement gently reiterates relationships from the first movement without being overtly repetitive. It also balances the first movement tonally, however, with its emphasis on subdominant key areas rather than dominant ones. We might nevertheless consider this reiterative; as the subdominant has “collapsed” into Iβ (B-flat) – we might consider whether this signals the finale’s course so strongly that it undermines it. Indeed, given all that has gone before, one wonders how the finale might feel tonally conclusive when the first two movements have already affirmed the tonic, or at least the tonic axis, so decisively.

Third movement
Franck’s critics castigate this movement. Like many of his chamber works, the third movement of this Symphony uses the late-Beethovenian technique of reusing themes from earlier movements in the finale. However, we will examine the tonal plan first: major third relatives and wholetone related keys extend the tonic axis, whilst the subdominant axis provides the main opposing force.

Figure 8.3: Franck, Symphony in D minor, III
D major
Allegro non troppo
1 – 36 D major I Touch on WT I; V – ii progression [25: Reh. A]
37 – 44 D major I [49: Reh. B]
45 – 50 F-sharp major Iα
51 – 71 Transition – B-flat; bar 70 V/I altered to become vii/IVα [68: Reh. C]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bar Range</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>7th</th>
<th>Result</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>72 – 79</td>
<td>B major</td>
<td>IVα</td>
<td></td>
<td>[84: Reh. D]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80 – 87</td>
<td>E-flat major</td>
<td>IVβ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88 – 93</td>
<td>G major</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94 – 97</td>
<td>V/B major</td>
<td>V/ivα</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98 – 124</td>
<td>B minor – flux – B minor ivα</td>
<td>(ii7–V7 103 – 104; V7 – i 109 –110)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125 – 139</td>
<td>B minor</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>2nd movement theme</td>
<td>[138: Reh. G]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All based on the subdominant axis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bar Range</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>7th</th>
<th>Result</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>195 – 202</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>WT 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203 – 211</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>WT 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>[203: Reh. K]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>212 – 227</td>
<td>G minor</td>
<td>iv</td>
<td></td>
<td>[224: Reh. L]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>228 – 245</td>
<td>Around G minor</td>
<td>iv</td>
<td>Sounds like V/C minor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268 – 299</td>
<td>D major</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td>[296: Reh. O]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300 – 317</td>
<td>D minor – major</td>
<td>i – I</td>
<td>2nd movement theme</td>
<td>[316: Reh. P]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>318 – 329</td>
<td>Axis sweep through every ‘9’ chord from E9 – F9. E9 rises chromatically up to C9 at</td>
<td>326, then becoming II9 – V9 in B-flat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>330 – 345</td>
<td>B-flat</td>
<td>Iβ</td>
<td>1st movement ‘C’ theme</td>
<td>[346: Reh. Q]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>346 – 365</td>
<td>Short transition – D</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>1st movement ‘A’ theme</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>366 – 381</td>
<td>E-flat</td>
<td>ⅮII</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>382 – 389</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>WT 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>[382: Reh. R]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>390 – 393</td>
<td>A-flat</td>
<td>WT 1 IIα</td>
<td>WT related to both E and B-flat, the chords of transition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>394 – 397</td>
<td>Transition to tonic via II9 – ⅮVI#6 – I#</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>398 – 440</td>
<td>D major</td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td>[398: Reh. S]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One of the most important tonal irritants makes itself known in the first 36 bars: a manipulation of the cycle of fifths. Though the music begins securely in D, at bar
there is an alternation of a B7 chord with one of F-sharp minor in the pattern V – ii – V – ii of E. This gives the effect of cycle of fifths movement, but backwards, so instead of the music moving forwards (as it would in regular cycle of fifths movement) it seems stuck, going nowhere. This occurs again between Reh. A+4 – 9 with the progression V – ii – V – ii – V♭9 in D. The technique is effective, as it can either suggest a key area without necessarily modulating there or weaken an arrival by its inverse harmonic pattern. (In this case, the arrival of the tonic is further weakened by the use of ♭VI between V♭9 and I at Reh. A+10 - 11.) Furthermore, as in the Violin Sonata (discussed in the next Chapter), backwards cycle of fifths manipulation can give an impression of drifting; however, in this movement it suggests modulation to E major that will be substantiated later. In the classical period a modulation to V/V would be common as preparation for a modulation to the dominant; bar 22 – 28 in the *Eroica* is such an example. Yet we know retrospectively that the dominant is not a main player in this movement, suggesting there is an ulterior motive. As Franck is using passive whole-tone modulation to effect tonal flatness, it is possible that E is utilised as a whole-tone relative rather than V/V.

From Reh. B+2 through Reh. D+9 there is a transitory section in which Franck uses German sixth chords to make his way around the entire subdominant axis: beginning in B and using a new theme, the initial tonic (B) is reinterpreted as a German sixth in the new key (E-flat) and resolves there as such. The procedure repeats itself in E-flat, whereby E-flat7 becomes a German sixth of G. At Reh. E we are back in B, having completed a sweep of the entire subdominant axis, but this time in the minor mode in preparation for the next section. This is a clear example of Schubertian structural stability, as well as Franck’s axial thinking.
The first instance of Franckian cyclicism occurs at Reh. F+4, which uses the Cor Anglais theme of the second movement before swiftly turning to the major for another subdominant axial sweep similar to B+2 through Reh. D+9. It seems that this modulation is moving “around” rather than “forward”; this stretch of subdominant material seems designed to offset the dominant axis bias of the first movement. However, it is arguable that this bias has already been sufficiently offset by the subdominant bias later in the first movement and further in the second. Is the finale attempting to perform a job that is not required? Only at Reh. H+8 does “forward” movement begin again, with E-flat moving to A-flat, this time instigating another axial sweep related in whole-tones that might seem to be dominant preparation: A-flat, C and E. Though we might refer to these keys as the supertonic axis (as they were functioning in the Quintet) in this case the keys are expanding the tonic wholetone scale rather than preparing the dominant, which only occurs here at a foreground level. Additionally, we might interpret this axis as IV of IV. But either way, the principal effect is of passive modulation. The movement reaches E at Reh. K, which could possibly be the fulfillment of the cycle of fifths movement begun in the first section. It is worth noting, though, that although we have reached ii – a traditional dominant approach chord – V does not materialise. What is stranger still is that thematic arrival does not align with tonal arrival: the arrival of one of the finale’s main themes at Reh. I is not reinforced cadentially – in fact, its arrival engenders axial modulation through A-flat, C and E. As such this technique lacks agency, and is explicitly un-Beethovenian.

More cyclicism appears at Reh. K+9, with a reminiscence of themes from the first and second movement in G minor. This is not a direct quote: in the antecedent phrase, however, the rhythm in the cello combines the first theme from the first movement within the tie across the bar that permeates the themes of the final movement, whilst the consequent phrase quotes the main theme of the second
movement and is merged with the rhythm of the second subject from the first movement.

Figure 8.4: Franck, Symphony in D minor, III, Reh. K+9 – 12

So, despite its apparent newness within this movement, Franck builds this theme on motivic ideas from this final movement, and reinforces the lack of thematic contrast without which sonata principle cannot operate. Though he may be using cyclicism both to provide contrast from the third movement’s themes and to imbue a sense of overall coherence between movements, the integration of cyclic themes in this movement is problematic: the quotations sound awkward as Franck transplants them verbatim rather than crafting them as integrated motifs. The worst offender is the Cor Anglais theme from the second movement, and Tovey describes the outcome:

The wisdom of the serpent is foreign to the harmlessness of the dove; and the combination has an exotic glamour all its own. The artistic danger of the combination is that innocence may break through in a disconcerting form of bad taste: the saint does not really know what the world understands of its formulas. And so the exquisite main theme of this middle movement will eventually find itself striding grandly, in its white confirmation dress, over a large area of the finale; and the finale has a mildly sentimental second theme of its own, which of all
types of phrase is most vulgarised by being given to red-hot brass, however softly played.  

We return to Reh. K+9. Although this subdominant minor has been a “tonal irritant” from the outset, here it can appear without threatening the true tonic. It is particularly unnerving though, because Franck crafts it in such a way that it sounds like v/C minor. Extensive and chromatic dominant preparation follows this, until the arrival of D major at Reh. N+6, featuring this movement’s main theme with tutti forces. This arrival too, however, is undermined by the placement of the seventh in the bass and scoring emphasising the leading note and augmented fifth. Further to this, a German sixth chord at Reh. O+3 replaces (and hence undermines) the dominant (as in the second movement). These examples suggest that Franck is deliberately avoiding direct movement from dominant to tonic. The music then turns to D minor, repeating the Cor Anglais theme that Tovey so maligns above. Though it is unsurprising that Franck reprises this theme in the tonic minor, he gives its return enormous weight with thick orchestration and loud dynamics. We might consider this a transcendent retonicisation, as the (nominal) main theme for this movement does not occur in the tonic. One recalls Tovey’s comment about the theme “striding grandly”: this recall simply sounds out of place and character. In defence of Franck’s orchestration, he confided in his pupils that if he were to write another Symphony “he would never provide the brass with parts like those he had written for them in the finale”. However, to accept this is to attribute the problem to scoring and nothing else.

Beethoven, the nineteenth-century archetype, employed daring thematic recall in his Fifth Symphony, recalling part of the Scherzo theme in the finale. We can interpret Beethoven’s recall as a threat to the sonata mechanism, undermining its

482 Tovey, Essays in Musical Analysis Volume II: Symphonies, 60.
483 Ibid.
484 Léon Vallas, César Franck, (George G. Harrap & Co. Ltd., 1951), 216.
teleology and “darkness to light” programme with its use of the tonic minor and placement at the end of the development. One might say that it is implacable, representing a fate that will eventually be victorious (death), but which the music can transcend. Tovey claims that it is: “a stroke of genius” and “a memory which we know for a fact but can no longer understand.”

This is because Beethoven’s recall is not purely thematic but also reminiscent of the gesture and timbre of the oboe’s recitative-like moment in the first movement as well as the first movement’s irregular phrase structure at the close of the development. Hence, in the finale, Beethoven recalls the three crisis moments at once: the first movement development’s irregular phrase structure, which obliterates forward movement; the oboe recitative, which does likewise by intrusion; and the funeral march, which is a dispirited version of the initially confident Scherzo theme. If we read the Fifth Symphony as autobiographical (as many commentators have done), it might represent survival: as much of a victory as possible within the confines of the human condition, acknowledged by the funeral march. Beethoven’s cyclicism in the Fifth Symphony, therefore, is cumulative. There is evidence to suggest that Brahms appreciated this depth of cyclicism (I discuss this further in Chapter Nine) but it seems that Franck’s cyclicism is merely singular, rather than cumulative.

This is why we do not make similar claims of Franck’s cyclicism in the Symphony: something more perfunctory is going on here.

The arrival of a new section refreshes the music: an axis sweep emphasising the tonic whole-tone scale related E-A-flat-C and ninth chords before a modulation to B-flat at bar 330, with antecedent-consequent phrasing between

485 Donald Francis Tovey, Essays in Musical Analysis. Volume I: Symphonies (London: Oxford University Press 1968), 44.

486 Incidentally, Franck does emulate Beethoven in one aspect of his cyclicism: the order of his recall. In his fifth Symphony, Beethoven recalls each gesture in backwards chronological order: first the Scherzo, then the oboe recitative, followed by the development’s conclusion; Franck similarly recalls the second movement theme before that of the first movement. However, Franck’s cyclicism remains purely thematic, whilst Beethoven’s is thematic, gestural and rhythmic (in terms of phase structure).
the flute and clarinet. As well as simplifying the texture from the immediate past melody, it “corrects” the V7-ii9 backward cycle-of-fifths movement of bars 18–21 to ii–V. At Reh. P+14 we arrive at B-flat, where the closing theme of the first movement appears. This recurrence seems much less hackneyed than the reappearance of the Cor Anglais theme because of the altered harmony in the third bar: it was V7 in the first movement, and here IVmaj9, lending a more relaxed feel than the decisive V – I emphasis it previously iterated, though squareness is still present. The aural distance between the first and final movement is also a factor here, and hence this theme sounds like a more distant memory than the Cor Anglais theme, which, due to its temporal closeness, sounds like a simple repeat. We might suggest that in many cases, temporal distance seems to govern the success of this type of cyclicism, which we see in the recalled themes of Beethoven’s Ninth and Bruckner’s Fifth and Eighth Symphonies. Beethoven’s Fifth may be the exception, but we must remember that his approach is multi-faceted, compressing several significant gestures into one important passage, and that the Scherzo reprised in the finale had not enjoyed an emphatic reprise within its own movement. Hence, temporal distance in Beethoven’s Fifth does not seem so problematic. Though Tovey is not explicit, his criticism of Franck is almost certainly informed by his admiration of Beethoven’s monumental achievement.

Returning to Franck, the third movement of the Symphony reminds us of the ninth chord’s importance in the transition from Reh. Q to Q+19. Rocking between D/F-sharp and D/G (no third, and thus more like G9 than D), the second chord becomes functionally ambivalent. It now seems that D has been confirmed beyond doubt, and V – I movement seems redundant, hence the emphasis here on less purely functional harmony and ninth chords. The G is persistent enough for a shift to E-flat at Reh. Q+20 to sound like an interrupted cadence, followed by another
semitone shift up to E at Reh. R. We then hear an axial shift: the G-sharp of E (in first inversion) is reinterpreted as I/A-flat – axial relative of II, which we might expect to reinforce the approach to the dominant as this the final approach to the tonic within the symphony as a whole. However, the transition to the tonic is made via a II9 – bVI#6 – I6 progression: Franck seems utterly determined to avoid ii – V – I! D major arrives at Reh. S, via a foreground E and G minor; D is settled on at Reh. S+28 with deliberate V to I movement in contrast to the “Tristan” cadences that ended the other movements.

Further thoughts
Prior to its premiere, Franck discussed aspects of the Symphony with his pupil Pierre de Bréville. It is apt to quote him at length here:

At the end of the first movement there is a recapitulation, exactly as in other symphonies, but here it is in an alien key. Then follow an andante and a scherzo. It was my great ambition to construct them in such a way that each beat of the andante movement should be exactly equal in length to one bar of the scherzo, with the intention that after the complete development of each section one could be superimposed on the other. I succeeded in solving that problem. The finale, just as in Beethoven’s Ninth Symphony, recalls all the themes, but in my work they do not make their appearance as mere quotations. I have adopted another plan, and made each of them play an entirely new part in the music. It seems to me successful in practice, and I fancy you will be pleased!\(^{487}\)

Clearly, Franck makes several points that reinforce our observations. Firstly, he describes the recapitulation (almost certainly referring to the E-flat minor section in the Allegro at Reh. O) as being in an alien key. This confirms the consideration of E-flat – in conjunction with its axial relative, G minor – as being a tonal irritant, clearly outside the realm of the tonic. Secondly, Franck’s idea of creating a scherzo equal in length to the slow movement suggests that he is concerned with structure.

\(^{487}\) Vallas, César Franck, 213.
and pace issues, attempting to avoid one movement being significantly longer than another. Furthermore, describing the second movement as “solving that problem” adds weight to the importance of compositional anxieties in late nineteenth-century symphonists. Thirdly, Franck’s assertion that the cyclic themes in the finale play “an entirely new part” implies an attempt at formal originality, reinforcing the idea that existing symphonic forms were becoming problematic and required revision.

So, is Franck successful? It seems to be a difficult question to answer. A number of peculiarities in Franck’s Symphony imply an awareness of structural issues, and his handling of large-scale form and large-scale tonality looks, on paper, successful. Aurally, however, his techniques become overbearing and overstated. The double exposition of the first movement could have been effective but for the emphasis placed on it by jagged juxtaposition. One surmises that it would have been sufficient contrast to hear the fairly remote modulation, but the complete stop and exact repeat of the opening material seems not only caricatured in its obviousness, but also neglects the sonata principle. The late-Beethovenian technique of problematising a tonic to rescue it later is more effective when the tonic quietly drifts into the distance; Franck’s D minor tonic demands we sit up and notice it has gone! We must concede, however, that despite the lack of subtlety in this technique it does suitably undermine D’s tonicity, proven by the appearance of D in the development section where it sounds more like an exotic modulation than a return to the tonic. Yet to view the tonal scheme as two rival tonics – D and F minor – makes the first movement seem more logical. Axial analysis is helpful in identifying areas where a key is prolonged, but there are instances where this type of analysis falls short and passages are better interpreted as wholetone relatives of the tonic (and therefore tonally flat) than as supertonic axis members. Axial analysis reveals a relative lack of tonal tension that corresponds with how the music sounds, and to label the A-flat-C-E axis as the supertonic implies that the
keys function as preparation for the dominant, but this is rarely the case: therefore the interpretation of such keys are whole-tone relatives to the tonic is more functionally accurate. Following on from the early emphasis of the dominant axis, it is logical to emphasise subdominant keys in the recapitulation and later movements to balance the rivalry. Classical Sonata form movements were often followed by slow movements in the subdominant for much the same reason. To summarise, we might say that Franck confirms D logically, but at the expense of rhythmic fluidity, so the Symphony as a whole makes tonal sense but frustrates with its rhythmic plainness.

In terms of form, Franck was ahead of his time in telescoping a Scherzo into a slow movement, with its shape as a large-scale variation form with subtle parodistic aspects. While fermatas add unnecessary weight, as in the first movement, overall the movement is formally innovative and melodically lyrical. It makes use of axial modulations that reinforce tonic and subdominant axis areas, with particular emphasis on IVβ (the Neapolitan) as a tonal area. The movement avoids the dominant and feels “inactive” as a result – that said, as a slow movement in variation form, “flatness” is to be expected.

What does seem to work in the final movement is the manipulation of the cycle of fifths. (I discuss this technique further in relation to Franck’s Violin Sonata in the next chapter.) However, such instances occur only at a foreground level and can only promote action (or inaction) for so long. More successful – in terms of creating integration of the Symphony as a whole – is the reuse of G minor with the recurrence of ‘a’ from the first movement. Both the theme and the key remind us of the first movement without creating additional tonal work for the finale to do (as G minor has already been refuted). As in the first movement, whole-tone-related key areas play an important role in expanding the tonic area without inciting tonal
drama. This keeps the movement tonally flat, with the aural emphasis being on quotations borrowed from other movements.

Franck’s techniques in terms of cyclicism may be summarised by René de Récy, who, when comparing Franck’s Symphony to Saint-Saëns’, stated: “[I]n a word, Saint-Saëns develops; César Franck arranges and combines.”\footnote{Cook, "Transformational Approaches to Romantic Harmony and the Late Works of César Franck", 139.} However, the same cannot be said of the Violin Sonata, one of Franck’s most well integrated cyclic works, which is the subject of the next chapter.
Chapter Nine

“Proto-Progressive” Tonality and Franck’s Violin Sonata

Franck’s Violin Sonata is an example of what I am arguing is proto-progressive tonality. This is not “progressive tonality” in that it does not begin in one key and end in another: rather, the Sonata’s opening movement undermines the assumed tonic, and the rest of the Sonata makes work of righting the tonality. There are some similarities here to the process at play in the opening movement of the Symphony. However, perhaps due to the more lyrical nature of the solo Sonata and a more assured handling of tonal and rhythmic processes – as well as a more subtle working of cyclic techniques – this Sonata is an exemplar of all that a proto-progressive work can be and do. Moments in the first and third movements arguably look forward to the impressionist techniques of Debussy, which is further evidence of both Franck’s ingenuity as a composer and his influence on the succeeding generation of French composers.

Violin Sonata in A

This 1886 work is one of Franck’s best known and loved.489 The movement employs a single “motto” theme throughout, which outlines a major ninth built from intervals of rising and falling thirds. Davies describes how this interval “posed the possibility of a rocking melodic figure – a kind of cybernetic oscillation – deriving its components from the notes of the

common chord. The composer’s favourite sequential devices were facilitated by its use”. Despite its derivation from the “common chord”, Franck’s ninth is something else. Indeed, the terms “rocking” and “oscillating” are apt terms to describe the harmony of the first movement. Whilst many works of the central European tradition tend to “compose out” foreground details into the background (which can often stimulate axial relationships), this work does not seem to. This sets the Violin Sonata apart from Franck’s Quintet and Quartet, and marks it as all the more unusual given the clear organic relationships between melodic material in and between movements.

**First movement**

The following table outlines the important keys used in the first movement.

**Figure 9.1: Franck, Violin Sonata, I**

A Major

*Allegretto ben moderato*

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 – 10</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>1st subject (violin) ‘A’. 9 – 10: German sixth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 – 14</td>
<td>to C-sharp</td>
<td>Iα</td>
<td>13 – 14: German sixth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 – 30</td>
<td>to E</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>Sequence, 17 – 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 – 34</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>2nd subject (piano) ‘B’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 – 36</td>
<td>Flux</td>
<td>around B flat and D flat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 – 38</td>
<td>to F-sharp minor</td>
<td>iα or vi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39 – 44</td>
<td>F-sharp minor</td>
<td>iα or vi</td>
<td>‘B’ (piano)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 – 46</td>
<td>to C-sharp minor</td>
<td>iα</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47 – 50</td>
<td>C-sharp minor</td>
<td>iα</td>
<td>‘A’ (violin)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 – 56</td>
<td>C-sharp minor – B minor – A minor</td>
<td>Sequence: 51 – 55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57 – 59</td>
<td>flux</td>
<td>fragments of opening</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

490 Ibid., 231.
The opening seems virtually impressionist due to the added notes in the first chord (whose function we do not yet know) and the lack of an assertive cadence in any key. The violin enters in bar five with the “motto” theme. However, this chord cannot automatically be interpreted as tonic or dominant (or anything else) as neither has been clearly defined – in fact, the use of V9 and ii chords, at least initially, impart a clear lack of functionality – though, their function becomes clearer as the movement unfolds. This is largely due to Franck’s deceptive use of quadratic structure. The violin’s entry in bar five establishes quadratic structure, confirmed by a new melodic idea in bar nine alongside a change of key and harmony in bar thirteen. With this quadratic structure comes a rhythmic hierarchy between bars of strong-weak-medium-weak. At first juncture, B minor (ii) sounds subsidiary to E9 (V9), but with the lack of any other harmonic movement it might well be interpreted as I9 – v – I9 – IV in E mixolydian, meaning (because of the rhythmic emphasis placed upon it) E9 could easily be a tonic or a dominant. To add to this ambiguity, E9 – B minor is a clockwise movement around the cycle of fifths, the opposite of functional tonality.491

491 If V9 – ii is reversed and repeated, the effect is altogether different, as the harmony pulls towards resolving onto I in the consequent bar because of the emphasis placed on V. Placing ii – V9 in this order gives a much more assertive progression, in which case A would, unequivocally, sound like the tonic.
Here, Franck’s use of the “chord pair” is significant both rhythmically and harmonically. Often paired with iambic rhythm, this device was a favourite of Franck’s and occurs when “the second chord carries with it the impression of a *sforzando.*”\(^{492}\) Trevitt describes the application of this technique in the first movement (bar 9) as “classical”, and indeed this instance of I – bVI#6 would not be out of place in a late classical symphony. However, Franck also “applied his method of thematic development to a harmonic context; a chord pair, for instance, may be repeated with slight alteration to the second chord, resulting in a stronger implied *sforzando.*”\(^{493}\) An important instance of this also occurs in the third movement of this sonata.

When A arrives in the second beat of bar 8, it is in the weakest possible place – harmonically correct, but metrically wrong. The clockwise cycle of fifths movement is partially fulfilled, as the first chord arrived on in bar 8 could be interpreted as F-sharp minor7 in first inversion, or A with added sixth, or a suspended F-sharp resolving on the second beat. Whether or not we consider the notion of double-tonic complexes at play here – the idea of F-sharp minor (IVα) rivalling A for tonicity is perhaps unlikely – it does suggest, at least at this point, that this opening possesses a strong subdominant bias. Bar nine – A again – does not strengthen A’s case for tonicity, but is found lacking arrival and harmonic traction as it has already occurred in the previous bar! The I – bVI#6 – I is a step toward confirming A, and this might be read as an undermining of A itself as the chord becomes a German sixth in bar 11, resolving to the new tonic, C-sharp. The cadence into C-sharp is also an emphatic one: German sixth –

---


\(^{493}\) Ibid.
V7 – I, and furthermore, C-sharp arrives at a structurally strong point, suggesting it has as much claim to tonicity as A at that point. It could even suggest the possibility of F-sharp, given the subdominant bias in this movement.

Though the use of axial relatives in this sonata is immediately evident, a strong subdominant-axis bias also permeates the first movement, and arguably the entire sonata.\textsuperscript{494} This, as well as ample use of the German sixth chord oscillating with the tonic, serves to undermine the tonic in the work overall by preventing it from fulfilling a strong I – V – I progression; effectively, the German sixth “emasculates” the tonic. Certainly, the first movement is not devoid of the dominant-axis altogether (there is an arrival on E at bar 25, which might act as the dominant of A or the axial dominant of C-sharp, depending on one’s perspective) nor inter-dominants, but such sonorities often turn in unexpected directions and do not function as we might expect. Similar progressions to the V9 – ii discussed above occur at bars 25 – 27 (in B major, V/V) and bar 32 (as part of the second subject). There is also a sense of harmonic relaxation in the #vi7 – vi – E/g-sharp progression which begins the sequence in C-sharp minor at bar 51. Between here and bar 59, each phrase is repeated a whole tone lower each time. Of particular note is the section between bars 55 and 60, which suggests C major by that chord and its German sixth. However, C (Vβ) then shifts to E (V/A) at bar 60, as we might expect at the end of the development section – yet this E does not perform a dominant function, “resolving” into V9 before the recapitulation (the harmony which does not include an emphatic cadence to the tonic). This passivity

\textsuperscript{494} The second movement is in the subdominant minor, D minor, and the third movement modulates from around D minor to F-sharp minor, another member of the subdominant axis.
reinforces the idea that “flatness” is Franck’s desired quality, as it is movement between, rather than within, whole-tone scales which generates harmonic momentum (bass movement in the strong cadential progression vi – ii – V – I oscillates between the two whole tone scales). This is in keeping with the subdominant bias of the movement; as well as belonging to the same whole-tone scale, these tones move away from, rather than toward, the dominant. It is apt to remember Bribitzer-Stull’s discussion of directional tonality and double-tonic complexes from Chapter Four, and consider that this might apply to this Sonata:

While directional [similar concept to progressive] tonality comprises the transformation of tonic function from one tonic chord (key) to another across the span of a piece, the two tonic keys of a double-tonic complex are not simply its opening and closing tonal centres: rather, they are the dual harmonic poles between which the music oscillates, at one point suggesting one key, and on another occasion the other.\textsuperscript{495}

This seems to be the case here: rather than a sense of teleology throughout the Sonata, there is a sense of two centers, which, though linked, function independently. How Franck achieves this is discussed below.

Rhythmically, in this work Franck often undermines harmonic arrivals such as V – I by placing them in weak places within a quadratic phrase, as discussed above. At the transition to the recapitulation (bar 62 – 63), E is both the final beat of bar 62 and the first beat of bar 63, giving it no sense of arrival. Furthermore, bars 83 – 84 use the V9 – ii – V9 – I progression – in E – and, just as the first time we heard it, this order weakens E’s arrival. Conversely, modulations into F-sharp and C-sharp (bars 38 – 39 and bars 46 – 47 respectively) are rhythmically and harmonically correct, affording

\textsuperscript{495} Matthew Bribitzer-Stull, "The End of Die Feen and Wagner’s Beginnings: Multiple Approaches to an Early Example of Double-Tonic Complex, Associative Theme and Wagnerian Form," \textit{Music Analysis} 25, no. 3 (2006): 324.
them a much greater sense of arrival. Most significantly, it would be difficult to argue that the first movement fulfils a I – V – I progression at a background level, as there is no prolongation of V due to the strong subdominant bias. This viewpoint might become problematic if we simply list the keys Franck modulates to in this movement – indeed; he does modulate to the dominant. The issue, though, is that the second subject in E is not tonally secure, and the only “confirmational” cadence comes at bars 38 – 39 in F-sharp minor – a subdominant axis key, IVα. Hence, there is a distinct lack of correlation between thematic arrival and tonal solidity, making the establishment of tonal hierarchy difficult. Furthermore, it is unclear where the development begins – by the time we sense any development we are back in the first subject group, and the recapitulation seems to passively occur rather than articulate its achievement. All these issues undermine any sense of dominant prolongation we might otherwise notice within the course of the first movement.

The subdominant axis encompasses D, F sharp and B-flat. A glance over the first movement will confirm that the music spends ample time in these areas, and often at significant structural points. From bars 34 – 37, following the occurrence of the second subject (given by the piano in bar 31, outlining a descending scale and using both G-sharp and G natural), there is a “leaning” toward B-flat. Though V♭9 of B-flat occurs twice, we do not get a cadence into B-flat, being “interrupted” by D-flat each time, and we might consider this further subdominant bias by the function of the (supposed) tonic axis being blurred – are F and D-flat I♭ and Iα, or V/IV♭ and V/IVα respectively? Reinforcing the V/IV potentiality, there follows a cadence into F-sharp minor, in which the second subject recurs.

---

496 Interestingly, this harmonic order can be reversed, and is in 45 – 46; V/C-sharp - ii occurs in C-sharp, and is then reversed to become a cadence into C-sharp minor.
We stay in this key until a modulation to C-sharp minor in bar 45, and this, too, is significant; though C-sharp is a member of the tonic axis, it relates closely to F-sharp, being its dominant, and at bar 47 we hear the first subject in this key. Furthermore, in the recapitulation, bars 71 – 73 feature the now familiar I – bVI#6 – I “circling” in D; bars 75 – 77 feature V9 – ii – V9 movement in F-sharp; and finally, bars 110 – 113 have a subdominant bias: I – bVI#6 – I occurs in D, and B-flats occur melodically in the violin. This strong subdominant emphasis in the recapitulation seems unusual if Franck’s desire is to affirm the tonic. If we consider that Franck is deliberately avoiding the dominant to emphasise the subdominant, however, these emphases seem more logical.

Another important aspect is the length of this movement – by classical standards it is disproportionately short. A survey of two recordings shows the timings of the movements to be 6.39/8.45/7.36/6.34 497 and 5.56/8.08/7.04/6.19498. Whilst classical finales are often shorter than their preceding movements, it is highly unusual for a first movement to be so short; calling into question Franck’s intended function for it. Tonally, we might describe this as “passive”: a background tonicisation of A is lacking, and there is a subdominant bias (discussed above). Davies also notes that this movement lacks development: “The structure of his [Franck’s] music is strangely inorganic. His material does not develop.”499 Veritably, no sooner have we become familiar with the second subject and undergone a short sequence using the first subject (bars 51 – 55 discussed above), than the recapitulation begins, with block chordal accompaniment, at bar 63. The precedent for this type of small non-tonicising first movement might

498 Cesar Franck. Franck: Sonata for violin and piano. Decca. 421 154-2 DM.
499 Davies, César Franck and His Circle, 231.
be Beethoven’s Op. 101 or 102 No. 1, discussed previously with the idea of proto-progressive tonality. Strengthening this possible precedent is the placement of the second movement in the subdominant minor, which I examine below.

**Second movement**

This movement parodies the first, in that the main theme relates closely to bars 9 – 12 of the first movement. However, unlike the most well known examples of parodistic scherzo movements, the key is D minor: iv, rather than the obvious I or i.\textsuperscript{500} The function of a parodistic scherzo is literally that: to parody, and this device is most effective if the following movement is in the same key, i.e. the tonic major or minor. Though it is not unusual for parodistic scherzos to be in sonata form, it is usually sonata form without development, as the composer may wish to withhold the tonal drama of the work overall.\textsuperscript{501} As such the effect is usually “static” tonal opposition by choice of a neutral key for the second subject, such as the tonic major or minor, relative major or minor, or a tonic or subdominant axis key. Beethoven’s tendency is often to use a type of modified sonata form but with a non-tonicising key relationship, such as C major in the Ninth Symphony’s D minor Scherzo and the Ghost Trio’s slow movement (not a Scherzo, but still parodistic). In this movement, however, Franck makes ample use of the dominant axis, making this movement far more dramatic than a traditional parodistic scherzo. Instances of tonal opposition occur as they would in a tonally dramatic movement, such as bars 88 – 93, some time before the recapitulation at bar 138. Also note that the E9 chord which did not function as expected in the

\textsuperscript{500} Examples in this category include Beethoven’s *Hammerklavier* Sonata and Ninth Symphony, Brahms’ Op. 7, and Mozart’s G minor Quintet.

\textsuperscript{501} Examples of this include Beethoven’s Ninth Symphony and *Hammerklavier* Sonata, as well as Brahms’ B major Piano Trio.
first movement here behaves as a dominant approach chord in the final
cadence, moving II9(b9) – V7(b6-5) – i.

So, then, if the role of the first movement is to act as a “passive” prelude,
then why put the “active” scherzo in the subdominant minor, particularly
given its parodistic elements? One explanation is that this is part of the
tonal ploy of proto-progressive tonality; by utilising a key other than the
tonic for an active movement (in that its own tonic is confirmed), then
creates further work for the later movements, which must – if the proto-
progressive plan is to hold – reaffirm the initial “true” tonality.

**Figure 9.2: Franck, Violin Sonata, II**

D Minor

*Allegro*

1 – 13 D minor i 1st subject piano ‘C’
14 – 23 D minor i ‘C’ violin
24 – 29 Transition D-flat reinterpreted as C-sharp
30 – 31 F-sharp minor iα Violin descending with ‘C’ extracts
32 – 33 Transition
34 – 43 D minor i ‘C’ altered
44 – 47 D minor i ‘A1’; based on ‘A’.
48 – 51 Around F Vβ 2nd subject ‘D’ – no cadence in F
though
52 – 55 Around A V ‘D’; no cadence in A either
56 – 59 V of B minor ivα Spanning diminished 7th
60 – 64 V of D minor i
65 – 66 V of F minor Vβ
67 – 78 F minor Vβ Confirmed by subdominant minor
in bars 69 – 70.

*Quasi Lento*

80 – 83 Transition F minor – E diminished
84 – 87  As 80 – 83, up a minor 3rd, ending on Aug 6th on B-flat, suggesting D or A

88 – 93  Similar to 67 - 78. F – A – B-flat minor, before A minor (v)

**Tempo 1 – Allegro**

94 – 97  on Am v Similar to bars 80 – 83; violin G-sharp diminished

98 – 102  Transition – C Aug 7 /F7d/D7d

*(Key change – C-sharp minor)*

103 – 108  C-sharp major/ minor – F-sharp minor (Va – va – ia) Related to ‘A’ (augmented)

109 – 111  C-sharp minor va ‘C’ (Piano only)

112 – 114  C-sharp transition – rhythmically related to ‘D’

115 – 121  G-sharp minor va/V As bars 109 - 111

122 – 125  F-sharp major Ia ‘D’ in piano

*(Key change – E-flat major)*

126 – 128  E-flat IVβ ‘D’ in piano

129 – 136  Combining ‘C’ in piano and ‘D’ in violin

137 – 150  D minor i Recapitulation

151 – 157  Related to 27 – 32 up a perfect fourth.

168 – 171  B minor ivα ‘A1’

172 – 175  D major I ‘D’

176 – 179  F-sharp major Ia More ‘D’ fragments

180 – 190  Spanning diminished 7th as bars 56 – 59

**Poco Piu Lento**

191 – 201  D minor i Confirmed by G minor subdominant in bar 193

202 – 229  D minor/major i/I Coda

As the analysis above shows, the development section (which is certainly present) utilises dominant axis keys, and there is little emphasis on the subdominant in this movement, save for the key of the movement itself being iv of A. The short instance of real sequence occurs in bars 88 – 93, where the violin melody moves up (though down in register) a major
third each time: A – C-sharp – F, oscillating between whole tone scales. As I discussed regarding the first movement – where the sequence stayed within the same whole tone scale – this oscillation stimulates harmonic intensity.

Furthermore, note the backward cycle of fifths movement between bars 17 – 18. Here, there is a two-bar pattern with V on the first beat and ii-dim7 on the third. We might consider this a unifying device as we have already experienced backward cycle of fifths movement in the first movement, and this will happen again in the finale. In this movement, the Scherzo, Franck straightens out this backwards movement within the theme itself in bars 22 – 23, and a similar process takes place in the finale.

Franck’s rhythmic devices are also at work: from the outset, our sense of phrase structure is disturbed, as there is a three-bar introduction before the piano begins the main theme. Accents are placed on the third beat every second bar in the melody – the highest note melodically in each phrase, to be sure, but still unsettling; the relaxed iambic nature of the first movement’s melody is literally reversed (we might consider it rhythmically parodied), becoming quaver-crotchet rather than crotchet-quaver and emphasising syncopations. Though the rhythm of the second subject is less syncopated, the piano provides polyrhythmic triplets in the accompaniment, creating a dramatic effect. Furthermore, bars 44 – 46 could be interpreted as a type of chord pair, throwing emphasis on the second beat and reinterpretting the nature of the first subject in the melody to put the emphasis on the A; this occurs similarly at bars 168 – 171, but with more decisive emphasis on the second beat. Finally, just prior to the recapitulation, there is an unexpected 2/4 bar which does not seem to provide any function other than to disturb the rhythmic flow. Also of note
is the four-note figure at bar 202; this figure is later inverted and used as thematic material in the finale.

Franck’s rhythmic innovations here are similar to those of Brahms. Take Brahms’ Op. 101 C minor trio, for example: this is a rhythmically sophisticated work, emphasising units of three and nine, often doubled. The first movement opens with paired phrases in 9/8; the second theme of the scherzo features pair of 3/2; and the third movement opens with pairs of threes (3/4, 2/4, 2/4 but there is a sense of a three-bar phrase in antecedent and consequent). This 3/4 2/4 2/4 pattern in the slow movement actually amounts to 7/4, which Brahms then expands on at the lyrical climax before the trio by essentially doubling his pattern, 3-3, 2-2, 2-2. The finale is particularly effective: there is an enlarging of tension between bars 240 – 246 by use of a 9/4 polymeter across 6/8. This simultaneously heightens the tension and release in the harmony, which can be summarised as statements of vii7 and I.

I have drawn this analysis from Peter Latham. As he discusses Brahms’ Trio explicitly, he notes that the above verbal description has “all the dullness of an exercise in arithmetic.” However:

translated into music as Brahms translates it, it is manifestly inspired. During the two bars of three the melody soars as it has never soared before; during the four bars of two it sinks to rest in a cadence that is final. One has the experience, so rare in art, of a thought expressed completely once and for all.

Though we might easily contest dated musicological description like this, Latham’s point is that the rhythmic pattern allows the music to reach its

---
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full shape and gain freedom, and that Brahms’ rhythmic innovations are as complex as his melodic development. It is through rhythmic innovation, coupled with a sophisticated musical integration across all other parameters, that Franck is able to gain the same sense of freedom in this Sonata.

Returning to the Violin Sonata analysis, one can see that D minor’s dominant axis plays a significant role in this movement. We might describe this as an instance of the transcendent subdominant with its own tonicisation processes, similar to Beethoven’s Op. 127, Op. 101 and 102 No. 1. However, rhythm becomes particularly important in the final two movements, as we shall see.

Third movement

In *The Classical Style*, Rosen remarks: “placing the minuet second instead of third in the order of the movement throws the expressive weight of a quartet or quintet towards its latter half.” It does not seem unreasonable that Rosen would extend this observation to solo sonatas also, particularly given the *Hammerklavier* and its deeply expressive third movement. Whether Franck’s decision to opt for this order was due to the parodistic scherzo or expressive weight we cannot be sure, but in expressive terms, this third movement is substantial in its emotional content. Davies describes this movement as recitative-like: “the cadenzas and flourishes proclaim a debt to the baroque composers, but the harmony remains modern.” Furthermore, the movement begins “around” one key (loosely
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D minor) and ends in another: a further recitative-like attribute. The key(s) of the movement are an important component of the Sonata overall; the keys of movements, respectively, are A – D minor – D minor (loosely) /F-sharp minor – A. On a smaller scale, Franck also links this movement with the earlier two by way of backward cycle of fifths movement in bars 12 – 13 and 15 – 16.

Furthermore, the opening theme comprises oscillating thirds (as in Figure 9.3); with this musical material, Franck evokes the main theme of the first movement as if he is starting the Sonata over again. This, in particular, captures the essence of Beethoven’s Op. 102 No. 1.

Figure 9.3: Bars 12 – 13 of Franck’s Violin Sonata, iii.

Figure 9.4: Franck, Violin Sonata, III

Opening interpreted as if it were D minor

Ben Moderato

1 – 4 Ambiguous tonally, ends on D7 - I

---

507 This suggests that Franck was on the cusp of Progressive Tonality: willing to employ it within a single movement, if not over the course of a larger, multi-movement work.
5 – 10  E-flat – G minor  \( \flat\) II or IV\(\flat\) – iv  Violin solo, related to ‘A’ – ‘A2’
14 – 16  E minor – C-sharp minor  v/V – va  As bar 11
17 – 21  C-sharp minor – dim  va  
22 – 25  As bars 1 – 4, but A  V  
26 – 31  B-flat – D minor  I\(\flat\) - i  Violin solo, ‘A2’
32 – 33  D minor  i  Violin triplets
34 – 44  Transition – Violin (semitravers)  Bars 41 – 44 Piano reminiscent of sonata opening, around G-sharp – V/V\(\alpha\)  
45 – 47  Arrival on A  V  Related to ‘A2’
48 – 50  Arrival on B-flat  I\(\flat\)  Related to ‘A2’
51 – 52  Arrival on B  IV\(\alpha\)  Related to ‘A2’
(\textit{Key change: F-sharp minor})
53 – 58  F-sharp minor  New i  
59 – 70  F-sharp minor  I  Violin new theme ‘E’ Bars 63 – 64 touches on Gm (Neapolitan); bar 65 theme minor third higher, but still F-sharp minor based.
71 – 80  F-sharp minor – D minor – F minor i – i\(\flat\) – va  ‘X’ theme
81 – 92  F-sharp minor  i  ‘E’
93 – 98  C-sharp major  V  Dominant pedal: Violin very similar to ‘A bars 97 - 99
98 – 100  Piano transition  
101 – 108  Transition  ‘X’
109 - 117  F-sharp minor  i  Bar 111 related to 17 – G-sharp/G natural

Here, Franck’s rhythmic manipulation is again evident, and the following table illustrates this: six bar phrases are present in this movement in the falling three-note phrase (\textit{Molto Lento} from bars 17 – 21) and the extension of the cyclic theme (bars 59 – 62, which recurs in the fourth movement). I have indicated all irregular phrases in bold.
Figure 9.5: Franck, Violin Sonata, III, rhythmic analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bars</th>
<th>Phrasing (bars)</th>
<th>Thematic/Harmonic Material (if significant)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 – 16</td>
<td>Irregular (recit.)</td>
<td>Violin largamente con fantasia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 – 21</td>
<td>5</td>
<td><em>Molto Lento: Three-note falling theme.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 – 25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Piano with opening material in new key</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 – 31</td>
<td>Irregular (recit.)</td>
<td>Violin largamente con fantasia ('A 2')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 – 40</td>
<td>3 x 3</td>
<td>Rising &amp; falling triplets – semiquavers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 – 44</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Semiquavers, extended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 – 50</td>
<td>2 x 3</td>
<td>Fantasia idea in violin, accompanied ('A 2')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 – 52</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Condensation of 45 – 47 phrase ('A 2')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53 – 58</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Lead into tranquillo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59 – 64</td>
<td>4 + 2</td>
<td>Tranquillo theme (reused in finale) ('E')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 – 70</td>
<td>4 + 2</td>
<td>As 59 – 64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71 – 80</td>
<td>8 + 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81 – 92</td>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>Tranquillo theme, then piano transition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93 – 100</td>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>Based on 1st movement theme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101 – 100</td>
<td>8 + 2</td>
<td>As 71 – 80 ('X')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110 – 111</td>
<td>6 + 1</td>
<td>Molto lento theme</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to the phrase lengths noted above, in bar 11, the piano part is related to the opening of the Sonata, but due to the different time signature (4/4 instead of 9/8) there is a sense of stillness rather than flow. The poignant *molto lento* section at bars 17 – 18 uses two chord pairs, and, as mentioned previously, the alteration of the second chord of the second pair gives the impression of a stronger *sforzando*.\(^{508}\) Here, Franck emphasises D-natural, the Neapolitan of C-sharp minor: this is the approximate key at this point. Further Neapolitan emphasis in F-sharp minor occurs around bars 63 – 64, where reach G minor (the Neapolitan,

\(^{508}\) Trevitt and Fauquet, "César Franck," 180.
which is also used between the Piano and the Violin in the opening); at bar 65 this theme occurs a minor third higher, but is still F-sharp minor based.

**Figure 9.6: Franck, Violin Sonata, III, bars 65 – 68**

![Musical notation](image)

Though the melody becomes more quadratic and relaxed from the modulation into F-sharp minor, the accompaniment continues to fight this rhythm with triplet accompaniment. Though this section feels relaxed, this underpinning is still rhythmically unsettling. Franck has used the Neapolitan in this way before, in both the Symphony (second movement before the recapitulation) and the Quintet, and it can have the effect of sounding like $b$VI of IV. Such harmonic ambiguity – albeit relaxed – is, however, not a feature of the fourth movement.

**Fourth movement**

Davies describes this movement as a “canonical rondo” of “entirely new design.” More specifically, its design is a type of sonata form, close to Beethoven Op. 102/1 finale in its canonical aspects, with what we might consider a written-out repeat of the exposition in $Ia$, C-sharp major. Also, note the similarity between this theme and Beethoven’s Op. 59 No. 1/i.

**Figure 9.7: Beethoven, String Quartet Op. 59 No. 1/1, bars 1 – 4**

![Musical notation](image)
Davies explains that, “What serves to distinguish this music from so much else that Franck wrote is its freedom from spiritual cant. Unburdened by any kind of programme, its melodies ripple like the water from a mountain spring.” I suggest that the freedom Davies mentions is synonymous with a freedom from quadratic structure. This is especially evident in the falling four-note phrase (first occurring at bars 224 – 229) which is phrased in six bar groups: unlike so much of Franck’s music, we cannot sense where the resolution will be from the outset, yet this hardly concerns us as the lyricism of the phrase is so stunningly beautiful.

**Figure 9.9: Franck, Violin Sonata, IV**

A Major

*Allegretto poco mosso*

| 1 – 37 | A major | I | Main theme: ‘F’ |
| 38 – 45 | A Major | I | ‘E’ in piano: touch on F-sharp minor (ivα) in bar 42 |
| 46 – 51 | Transition to C-sharp minor (iα) which arrives at bar 49: C major bar 47 (Vβ) |
| 51 – 64 | C-sharp minor | iα | ‘F’, violin leading |
| 65 – | F-sharp minor | IVα | ‘E’ in violin |
| 73 - | C major | Vβ |
| 80 – 98 | E major | V | ‘F’, piano leading, developing falling motif |
| 99 – 108 | C-sharp minor | iα | ‘A1’: E pedal throughout harmony changes |
| 109 – 116 | Transition – chains of diminished chords in piano |

---
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The approach to the recapitulation (using i) is particularly unusual, with none of the dramatic vigour we might expect at this point. This oblique arrival also has links to late Beethoven: examples include bars 159 – 160 in the C-sharp major finale of Op. 131, and the recapitulation of the Hammerklavier’s first movement. Here, Franck simply “falls” into the major without using the dominant. The reprise of the main theme at bar 186 does not constitute an arrival at all, as we have been hearing A major for the previous two bars. However, we do get a significant arrival at bar 222, due to Franck reversing the V9 – ii progression (perhaps more aptly described as regression) set up in the first movement. Bars 211 – 212 use V and ii respectively, but B minor then turns up abruptly on the second beat of bar 212. This allows Franck to place B minor in the next bar at a strong metrical point – the third of a four bar phrase, which is then followed by V6 in the fourth bar. After a little more rhythmic alteration, the tonic itself finally arrives at a strong rhythmic point in bar 222, brought about by an emphatic vi – ii – V7 – I progression. I illustrate the significance of Franck’s
rhythmic structure in the following table, with irregular phrase lengths in bold type.

**Figure 9.9: Franck, Violin Sonata, IV, rhythmic analysis**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bars</th>
<th>Phrasing (bars)</th>
<th>Thematic/Harmonic Material (if significant)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 – 29</td>
<td>Regular (4)</td>
<td>Main theme (canonic) (‘F’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 – 37</td>
<td>4 + 3 in Violin</td>
<td>Cadence between 36 – 37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 – 45</td>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>B theme (‘E’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 – 51</td>
<td>4 + 2</td>
<td>Heading to C-sharp major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52 – 59</td>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>Main theme (‘F’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 – 64</td>
<td>4 + 1</td>
<td>Cadence between 63 – 64 into F-sharp minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 – 72</td>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>B theme (‘E’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73 – 78</td>
<td>4 + 2</td>
<td>To E major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79 – 86</td>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>Canonic (‘F’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87 – 98</td>
<td>2 x 6</td>
<td>Falling theme, derived from main (‘F’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99 – 102</td>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>Theme in 3rds, related to 3rd movement (‘A1’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103 – 108</td>
<td>4 + 2</td>
<td>As 99 – 102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109 – 116</td>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>Chromatic transition – piano alone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117 – 132</td>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>Based on main theme (‘F’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133 – 138</td>
<td>2 x 3</td>
<td>Piano – main theme derivation in LH, A-flat minor (‘F’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139 – 142</td>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>Piano – as 133 – 138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143 – 150</td>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>3rd movement theme in Violin (‘X’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151 – 156</td>
<td>2 x 3</td>
<td>As 133 – 138 but in B-flat minor (‘F’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157 – 160</td>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>As 139 – 142, but in F minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161 – 168</td>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>3rd movement theme in Violin (‘X’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169 – 184</td>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>Some rhythmic crossover with Violin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>185 – 212</td>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>Main theme back in tonic major (‘F’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>213 – 220</td>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>Cycle of fifths ‘righted’, emphatic V – I cadence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>221 – 227</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Falling theme, derived from main</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>228 – 235</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Falling theme, derived from main</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>236 – 239</td>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>Ending 4 bar phrase, cadence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>240 – 242</td>
<td></td>
<td>Final Flourish</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Of particular importance is the correlation between the falling theme (a derivative of the main theme) and six-bar phrasing. This is a connection with the six-bar phrasing evident in the third movement, which it shares with Beethoven’s Op. 102 No. 1: both works feature a falling four-note figure that coincides with six-bar phrasing, and in Franck’s Sonata this is a connection to the upward four-note figure that ends the second movement. One cannot attest to Franck’s rhythmic regularity here; in this Sonata the music begins to shake free from Franck’s quadratic tendencies.

**Franck and cyclic thematicism**

Lawrence Davies asserts that the “habit of building entire works around a ‘motto’ theme gradually took possession of the composer, as it is alleged to have done with Beethoven and Tschaikovsky, leading him to view the Violin Sonata and the D minor Symphony in the same light.”\(^{511}\) It is easy to hear the connections between themes in the Violin Sonata; Franck builds the cyclic materials with the same bricks of recurring melodic intervals. The intervals of a major and minor third occur frequently, for example, often juxtaposed.

We have referred to the first and main theme (and first subject of the first movement) as ‘A’. It is made of rising and falling thirds, outlining a dominant major ninth, and feels rhythmically relaxed, being in 9/8 time. The second subject (‘B’) falls by step then sighs. Continuing to the second movement, the first theme here (‘C’) moves chromatically then up by minor third. ‘C’ is partially derived from a melodic fragment of the first movement (first movement, bars 9 – 12). Due to this link, the scherzo has a feeling of parodying the first movement. Furthermore, the dotted crotchets
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followed by quavers – such as those in bar 20 – seem like an intensification or parody of the flowing crotchet quaver rhythm of ‘A’. Also closely related is the theme at bar 44 ‘A1’, outlining a D minor chord by first rising a major third, similar to ‘A’s first occurrence in the first movement. Moreover, the shape of the second movement second subject (‘D’) is similar to the shape of ‘B.’ Figure 9.11 is provided for reference.

Figure 9.11: Franck, Violin Sonata, main themes
Franck builds the third movement from both new and recycled material. The violin solo from bar four draws on minor and major third movement, which I refer to as ‘A2’. Bar 11, featuring only the piano, is reminiscent of the opening of the Sonata, but does not feel as relaxed: this is partially due to the 4/4 rather than 9/8 rhythm. Two new themes occur in this movement: ‘E’ at bar 59, a tranquil melodic idea, and ‘X’ at bar 71, featuring a swooping fall of the major sixth. The final movement recycles the most material. The main theme (‘F’) has a similar melodic contour to ‘A’ in its arch shape, and we can hear a relationship between it and ‘C’ with some filled-in passing notes. The fourth movement also features recurrences of ‘E’, ‘A1’ and ‘X’. There are also cyclic connections that are rhythmic rather than harmonic: Franck uses six bar phrases in both the third and fourth movements for important melodic material, and the significance of these uneven phrase lengths cannot be underestimated; the rhythmic expansion and lack of predictability seems to be one of the driving forces contributing to the success of this Sonata.

As I discussed in relation to the Quartet, in Chapter Seven, Franck was particularly fond of the Beethovenian technique of directly recalling previous movements at the opening of the fourth movement. Franck uses this technique in the String Quartet, and elements of cyclic thematicism in the Quintet and the Symphony. Although cyclic thematicism has much compositional potential, Franck’s attempts at this borrowed technique can often sound contrived, and this is one of the consistent faults I have found with the works examined previously. In the Violin Sonata, however, thematic recall is crafted more subtly: although the fourth movement recalls themes from all movements, Franck integrates each theme into the form. The sense of satisfying inevitability perhaps comes from the recall of more than one event simultaneously; the second subject reappears in the
tonic key, but the second movement’s phrase also appears. The references occur in reverse order: ‘E’ from the third movement is heard first, then A1 from the second movement (and based on the first subject of the first movement), and the four note falling motive, which dominates the coda, is very similar to the second subject from the first movement. More importantly though, these are not mere quotes that remind us of the previous themes; they are integrated into the fabric of the sonata, crafted in new ways. The fourth movement is particularly effective in this way, as Franck reminds us of what has been overcome tonally – the darkness of the second movement’s D minor, and the third’s intense yearning is re-framed in the “sunny” fourth movement, affirming A beyond doubt and in an immensely lyrical manner.

This Sonata stands alone within Franck’s oeuvre. Harmonically, it is well structured, and Franck’s gift of melody is at its best. More importantly, though, one perceives a more mature handling of form; a lyric freedom that is, as Davies asserts, free from Franck’s usual “spiritual cant”.512 It provides very enjoyable listening indeed, and I believe that this analysis, at least in part, validates the Sonata’s popularity.
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Chapter Ten

Conclusions

The previous analyses have demonstrated how axial tonality might inform ideas about Franck’s compositional techniques. Franck was not a composer who found one compositional method and continued with it for his career; he tried different models – some of which were arguably more successful than others – without an apparent clear chronological development. He shares this experimentation with models with Brahms: despite varying compositional results, Brahms and Franck also share an admiration of (potentially extending to a preoccupation with) late Beethovenian form. What this lack of chronology in Franck’s use of form suggests is: a) Franck did not remain content with any formal model he tried, possibly because, b) Franck did not comprehend all the complexities of late Beethovenian form as, indeed, few did.

Because of this mixed compositional method, different types of analyses have been appropriate for different works, as we have discovered. Both axial-hexatonic and pc set analyses have proved relevant as they reveal, respectively, different elements in different compositions. Through this, both background and foreground procedures can be illuminated.

All the analyses provide strong evidence that Franck was aware of the potential of axial relationships and the way they might be used, specifically by incorporating aspects of late-Beethovenian forms. This is evidenced in details as small as voice-leading and as large as an over-arching key-scheme. In the discussion below I reiterate the late-Beethovenian models, grouped with the Franck works that
identify with them, and reinforce the significant details in support of my conclusions.

**Beethovenian Models**

1) The Eroica model: a “classical” tonicizing Sonata Form movement with an immanent dominant and transcendent subdominant or axis equivalent (such as vi in the *Eroica*). Though Franck does not seem to use the *Eroica* model in any of the works examined here, it is important to recall the importance of this model as a point of departure. Schubert aside, composers after Beethoven realised the difficulties that ensued later in multi-movement works if such tonicizing movements were used at the opening. They sought other models, and within these, late Beethoven forms loom large.

2) The Op. 127 model: a “middle-heavy” work with a transcendent subdominant used to reserve the dominant until later in the work (this differs from the proto-progressive model in that the tonic is not initially undermined). Franck does not seem to use this model either, though Franck’s String Quartet uses aspects of this paradigm and that of Beethoven’s *Hammerklavier* in its use of a transcendent subdominant in the third movement (as the second movement of Op. 127) and a central fugal section in the first (*Hammerklavier*).

3) The mono-axial model: where one axis forms the basis for the entire work, such as in Franck’s Quintet, Symphony and Symphonic Poem *Le chasseur maudit*. Some of the smallest gestures here reveal Franck’s awareness of axial and related harmonic relationships to evoke neutrality. Foreground examples include the cadences in bar nine and eleven in the second movement of the Piano Quintet, where E major is used as the dominant of both F and A minor, and the end of the Quintet’s final movement with D-flat chords on the downbeat disturbing the effect of tonicity F is (supposedly) meant to give.
Harmonic movement within the foreground of a work also belies Franck’s awareness of the potential of the mono-axial model and the effect of different types of harmonic movement. *Le chasseur maudit* demonstrates this in the use of minor thirds to represent the hunter’s exertions within a larger framework of passive major third axial modulation. This underlines the outcome Franck seems to infer is inevitable.

Furthermore, the Symphony’s double exposition is one of the clearest examples in the repertoire of an axially related key being set up to rival another for tonicity; given the i – vβ relationship between D minor and F minor, we might describe this as a case of the *Eroica* model in the first movement, perhaps redolent of Beethoven’s fifth in its melancholic introduction. Though arguably simplistic in its conception and effect, the exposition of the first movement of the Symphony certainly succeeds in promoting opposition between the two axially-opposed keys. The same might be said of processes within the exposition of *Le chasseur maudit*, though this effect is actually different as Franck uses tonic axially related keys: G, E-flat and B minor are I, Iβ and Iα respectively, rather than the Symphony’s dominant-related D minor and F minor (i and vβ).

The background structure of the multi-movement works is also significant. The Quintet’s overall key scheme (between movements) is F minor – A minor – F minor. This in itself is an axially “flat” scheme, potentially suggesting that drama will be created in other ways. However, the final movement emphasises other keys (particularly D-flat and B-flat minor) to the extent that F’s tonicity is threatened, suggesting that Franck may have been experimenting with harmonic effect on a large scale, which we have discussed as proto-progressive tonality. Notably, Franck’s only Symphony is also mono-axial: its movements are in D, B-flat and D.
4) The Op. 131 model: here the dominant is reserved for late in the work through axial modulation prior to the final movement(s). This fits relatively well with Franck’s String Quartet, though it is formally less clear-cut than many of the other works discussed here. However, Franck’s use of F minor (V\(\beta\)) as the key of the fugue in the middle of the Quartet’s first movement also echoes the D minor – F minor relationship of the Symphony, and additionally may be linked to Beethoven’s use of Fugue in the *Hammerklavier*. The employment of F-sharp minor (i\(\alpha\)) for the second movement belies further axial awareness, and though the use of the relative minor is common for a slow movement, the key of B minor remains almost unattainable in this movement, which itself predominantly uses subdominant axial relatives, such as the Neapolitan (IV\(\beta\)) at bar 103.

5) The proto-progressive model: here, the initial tonic is undermined from the outset whilst another key is tonicised, before the original tonic is “rescued” late in the work. Beethoven employs this model in Op. 101 and Op. 102 No. 1, wherein a small opening movement in a weakly tonicised key is overwhelmed by a disproportionate emphasis on the subdominant area, with the initial tonality only “rescued” in the final movement. Franck’s Violin Sonata and the third sketch of *Psyché* use this form, as does the Symphony (as a possible interpretation). The Violin Sonata’s first movement, in A major, is preludial in effect and is the shortest movement of the four, whilst the second movement is a dramatic scherzo strongly tonicizing D minor (iv). The third movement begins with its key unclear (though it suggests D minor) and then ends in F-sharp minor, whilst the finale tonicises A major. The tonic is indeed “rescued” in the final movement, but not before the subdominant axis has made its presence felt strongly in the second movement. The lack of unequivocally functional tonality in the first movement is important, as it allows a rival key to assert itself in a later movement.
Chromaticism

What makes Franck different from his contemporaries, specifically those composing in the same genres? I suggest one difference is his rich chromaticism and characteristic application of it. His chromatic idiom includes (but is not limited to) the addition of sevenths and ninths to chords, which may or not act as dominants and may or may not resolve; the use of German sixths and diminished sevenths to modulate remotely in both the regular sense and also irregularly (such as the way the German sixth is manipulated in the Piano Quintet); the use of augmented triads as enhanced dominants; the use of the axial-hexatonic system as both a foreground and background organizational principle; and organizational principles that may not be strictly diatonic or even diatonically chromatic. This last feature we see particularly in the Piano Quintet, which we might consider a breakthrough in Franck’s use of a pc set: it is a “new way” compositionally, and results in a uniform sonic world that prefigures the late works of Liszt.

Franck was unarguably chromatically innovative, being much more chromatic than many of his contemporaries composing in similar genres, including Brahms, Saint-Saëns, d’Indy and other pupils. At some moments, Franck’s harmony looks forward to Impressionism and the dissolution of functional harmony, though this is only ever momentary. However, Franck’s chromaticism is nevertheless linked to many of the complaints and criticisms of his work. What my analysis has demonstrated is that axial tonality is an organizational element in Franck’s work and can help us understand many of the difficult elements in the works that have been examined. Such axial analysis may help us to perceive stability where we were previously unsure of it, but does not – and does not aim to – alleviate other criticisms levelled at Franck’s chromaticism. For, whatever the organizational principle, the most important element must always be the overall effect of a composition, and if this is poor or has problematic elements then the initial
organizational principle has either been ill-applied or requires other parameters to be manipulated for its success.

Take, for example, the Piano Quintet. The analysis using pc sets is appropriate – it shows the organization of the work is coherent from background to foreground levels. Franck’s use of a pc set cannot necessarily be considered new: Beethoven’s *Schreckensfanfare* is paradigmatic; Franck’s Quintet and such compositions only extend the concept of annihilating tonality. Via this analysis, Downes’ and Cohn’s respective theories are proved compatible: Downes’ “passive modulation” is Cohn’s “annihilation”, both theorists arguing for a consideration of a tonal opposition which is not achieved.

Yet the coherence that pc sets lend is not necessarily enough to create an engaging composition, and the result of the pc set use here – and its saturation – is the creation of the aforementioned “sound” that we associate with Franck and his harmonic procedures mentioned above. Liszt uses a pc set in *La Lugubre Gondola*: yet this is a very short and programmatic work, about five minutes long, and is formally incomparable to the extended sonata form – variations – modified sonata form that moulds the Quintet. Thinking from an organist’s perspective, the same might be said of Bach’s Chorale Preludes; though there are some that stand out for their craftsmanship, they share a sonic world that incites coherence but not compositional drama. Clearly, though, this comparison belongs to a different compositional world.

However, if we can compare Franck to Reger – a fellow organist whose compositions have motivated much debate and analysis about function and harmony – it seems clear why Franck’s organ works fill more concert programmes than those of Reger. Keeping Reger’s quip that “any chord can follow another chord” in mind, we might surmise that any work crafted with such a mindset is
going to have few organizational principles to adhere to, particularly harmonic ones. Comparing this to Franck, who has a solid soundworld even if it may become tiresome after three movements, the elements that contribute to coherence become clear: harmony does work in this way.

**Tackling late Beethoven and the Hammerklavier**

This thesis references the *Hammerklavier* Sonata a great deal. That this work proved influential to composers in the Second Age of the Symphony is evidenced in the *Hammerklavier* quotations detailed in the Piano Quintet chapter. This affect is reinforced by other Beethoven quotations: those of the *Lebewohl* Sonata and the Op. 130 String Quartet (referenced in the String Quartet chapter). Though not Symphonic, the *Hammerklavier* seems to represent the problem of the finale, which may be one explanation for the ongoing curiosity composers have with it. However, whether Franck, Mendelssohn, the young Brahms or anyone else actually perceived all of the compositional processes inherent in the *Hammerklavier* is an issue for debate. I suggest that though many composers may have sensed that there was something “different” or even transcendent about the *Hammerklavier*, few grasped the compositional processes sufficiently to emulate it successfully. One might argue that Brahms did – indeed, by the time Brahms had reached compositional maturity, his large-scale works were able to articulate a dominant withheld and reserved for a final movement, which might account for much of the success of, say, his third Symphony. A mono-axial end-weighted shape is by no means the only way to handle large scale form, but it is an effective device if a teleological feel is desired throughout a large-scale work. Comparing Brahms’ third to Franck’s Symphony, we are reminded of Dahlhaus’ assessment of the String Quartet: the problem of making problems “manifest” rather than “concealing them in artifices”.\(^{513}\) Problematization may be a genuine form
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generator, evidenced in the double exposition of Franck’s Symphony: however, one cannot help but perceive the problem within the double exposition, and so perhaps Franck’s difficulty indeed lay in the crafting of compositional artifice, as Dahlhaus suggests.

**Franck’s Chromaticism in Form**

When Liszt developed the Symphonic Poem, he quipped that “new wine demands new bottles”.

Though he was referring to the title “Symphonic Poem”, I believe the quote can also be interpreted in this context, relating chromaticism to form. In the classical style, tonality articulated form (read sonata form). If that tonality is challenged by the density and richness of chromaticism, then the form will likely need to be altered, even if diatonic principles at large are adhered to. I suggest that this is one of the problems we sense in Franck’s work but find difficult to articulate: he is classical in genre but Wagnerian in harmony. How can the two co-exist? Recalling the Dahlhaus contention alluded to above, the assessment may seem harsh, but it succinctly expresses the problem we perceive in much of Franck’s music; a seeming incompatibility of form and harmony. However, this may also be linked to large-scale axial organization: many seminal nineteenth century works use axial relations to articulate a broader structural coherence, such as Liszt’s B minor Sonata or Brahms’ Third Symphony. However, whilst this is true of some of Franck’s works, others do not share such tonal fissures and therefore do not cohere to a wider organisational principle. Such fissures might include the role of E-flat at the start of the Quartet, and similarly the E-flat in the introduction of the Quintet; though E-flat is expounded as a key area at the beginning of the respective works – creating a tonal fissure in both cases – the fissure does not then play out functionally.
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I do not suggest, however, that Franck was unaware of such issues. I suggest that part of Franck’s use of cyclicism (as in the recalling of early themes late in a work, not the subtler integration closer to thematic transformation) was an attempt to add an additional element of integration to a composition, the coherence of which could be compromised by the density of its chromaticism and the formal-harmonic relationship. The Piano Quintet, String Quartet and Symphony all display elements of cyclicism; they also possess some of the richest chromaticism in the canon. It seems likely that Franck desired a deeper sense of coherence, and cyclicism in a Franckian sense is an easy enough device to apply. However, as Dahlhaus states, “to prevent the recurrence of a theme from sounding like an interpolated quotation it must be integrated into the musical context.”

Here, it is apt to return to the discussion from the first chapter concerning the differences between cyclicism and thematic transformation. “Cyclic form” might be the better term applied here, which we earlier described as applying to: “works where thematic links bind more than one movement” rather than “applied to mere thematic resemblances.” This description is very similar to Taylor’s designation of “cyclicism” as “close thematic affinity between movements or, more properly, explicit recall of music from one in another.” If we look for aspects of “thematic recall” in Franck’s works, then, the term “cyclic form” can certainly apply to the Piano Quintet, the Symphony and the String Quartet. The last example here is particularly overt in its Beethovenian thematic recall, the problematic use of which I discussed in Chapter One, further evidencing both the influence Beethoven and his late forms had on nineteenth century composers and the difficulties those composers had in fully understanding Beethoven’s formal methods.

The “Thematic Transformation” definition we used earlier describes it as: “a term used to define the process of modifying a theme so that in a new context it is different but yet manifestly made of the same elements.” These Franckian works which use thematic transformation, are, I suggest, more successful: these are the Violin Sonata and Psyché. The effects of such transformations are discussed in their respective chapters; however it is worth recapping why such effects might be considered more successful. The understanding of music as an experience of a teleological process became prominent in the nineteenth century, specifically, with the works of Beethoven. It is apt to quote Scott Burnham here:

[There was an] important shift in early nineteenth-century music criticism to the standpoint of the whole, a shift arguably brought about as a response to [Beethoven’s Eroica and other heroic works]. In the case of Beethoven, repeated hearings were now deemed necessary for a complete understanding of any of his works. Making sense of the local complexities of this music depended on knowing the entire process, for an inherent destiny is projected back onto the idiosyncrasies of Beethoven’s themes by the way they come to be consummated in the coda. The music is heard to be about thematic process and development; the full understanding of a theme waits upon a knowledge of its eventual outcome.

Though Burnham later challenges the notion of perceiving music as a process (or in terms of progress), this mode of thought is very much present today, and certainly would have been within Franck’s lifetime. Therefore, I suggest that it is more satisfying to recognise the reminiscence or relative of a theme, which we can recognise as having progressed and changed, than identifying a simple recall. Transformation denotes progress, having reached a time or place different from where the music started, and notions of progress are positively associated with large-scale form. In Psyché, this transformation is associated with the transformation of Psyche’s being into a goddess, and is wholly appropriate in the
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programmatic context. Examining the context of the initial theme and that of the fourth sketch, it is also linked to Psyché’s sleep and awakening, both in a physical and mythological sense. In terms of progress, cyclic form simply returns to or reminds us of a theme’s initial musical state, without a sense of progression.

However, the most important aspect to consider in the success of the Violin Sonata (and, conversely, many of the formal-harmonic problems with Franck’s other works examined here) is the consideration of other altered parameters. Franck’s chromaticism seems incompatible with the form of many works, which – as I have suggested – may be part of his reason for using cyclic form. When examining the Quintet, I suggested that if such rich chromaticism is to be successful, then other parameters such as form, rhythm and phrase structure must be altered to give a sense of formal unity as appropriate. The Violin Sonata is one of the few Franck works examined here which pairs the attainment of the structural dominant with an altered rhythmic emphasis in the final movement. This throws musical weight onto a significant structural moment in a way that rarely occurs in Franck’s work, and I suggest that this may contribute to the Violin Sonata’s ongoing popularity and success. This rhythmic manipulation is particularly significant given that criticisms levelled at much of Franck’s output pertain to his “four-square” approach to rhythm. To the uninitiated, it might be difficult to believe that the same composer who wrote these quadratic themes in the Symphony, Quintet and Psyché –
– also composed the lilting 9/8 of the Violin Sonata’s opening movement, the recitative-like yearning in its third, and this manipulation of emphasis in its final movement. This is not to say that other composers did not write quadratic phrases when it was appropriate to do so; of course, such phrases are the building blocks of classical music, in particular the Viennese School. Beethoven’s late period Quartets provide examples where visionary quadratic phrases are used, but with a sense that they represent a utopian view that cannot – will not – be attained; hence such phrases usually disintegrate, such as the end of the Heiliger Dankgesang of the A Minor Quartet Op. 132.520 In Franck, however, such phrases are the utopia: the melodic goals, the main material. As Kerman writes, regarding the Op. 127 Quartet in E-flat:

The folk-like tone [including quadratic phrasing] is so magical and true, so lively and calm, that one feels solemn to talk about subtleties of construction . . . But folk

---

accents can sound banal just as easily as enchanting. What sets and assures the tone is the way the musical elements are put together.521

Dahlhaus realises the problematic relationship between periodic structure and harmonic enrichment, and states: “the procedure is self-defeating as long as the technical and aesthetic criterion is the rule that development of all the elements of the composition should be analogous.”522 Franck’s rhythm and phrase structure does not seem as developed as harmony and cyclic form in the Symphony and String Quartet. If this is the case, we must examine works of other composers to deduce more successful methods.

If we were to compare Franck to a Teutonic composer who composed in similar genres to Franck but with a different sense of rhythmic organization – Brahms – we would observe that although Brahms’ harmonic palate is rarely as chromatic as Franck’s (though chromatic nonetheless), Brahms possesses a strong sense of the importance of rhythmic organization, particularly polymeter. Conversely, in Franck, because of the consistent quadratic structure, we sense when the music is going to resolve, even if we do not know how. Therefore, despite Franck’s innovative chromatic idiom, his grasp of innovating phrase structure is usually weak. Dahlhaus writes that Franck “emphasises rhythmic foursquareness”, and this is particularly evident in the Symphony and Piano Quintet. I support Dahlhaus’ view that, ideally, there should be a correlation between rhythmic structure and chromaticism. However, Franck’s success in this area is illustrated by the complementary harmonic and rhythmic analyses in the chapter on the Violin Sonata. It is also important to note that different genres require different handling of musical material. What might be appropriate for a Symphonic Poem may not be

521 Ibid., 234.
522 Dahlhaus, Nineteenth Century Music, 62.
for a chamber work or even a symphony. This, I believe, can account for some of Franck’s rhythmic foursquareness, or dense chromaticism, but not all of it.

The analysis now complete, I wish to address the semantics of Cohn and Downes’ “annihilation” and “tonal passivity” respectively. Evidently, both commentators are addressing the same phenomenon: the use of axial relatives to prolong a harmonic area, whilst retaining tonal flatness. Yet, we must note that “annihilation” possesses destructive, negative overtones, whilst “tonal passivity” is a more neutral phrase. I suggest that both terms are useful in future axial analysis. “Annihilation” may be appropriately used to describe instances like the Schrekenfanfare, where – through superimposed chords – tonality (and all that has gone before it in the Symphony) is indeed “annihilated”. In contrast, “tonal passivity” may describe instances where tonic or subdominant axial relatives prolong a key area for an expressive purpose, such as Beethoven’s use of the tonic axis in Op. 127 or many of Schubert’s slow movements. A lack of tonal action can be expressive; negative overtones are not necessary in such cases.

Franck did compose some works of great beauty, but other works are dogged with problems that he did not, and I would argue could not, resolve. Axial tonality offered additional means of coherence whilst maintaining a chromatic idiom, but the compositional environment was a difficult one and, reception history would prove, not enough. Examining the problems and utopias of this era is a theoretical minefield, one which I predict to be active for some time to come.
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