

Society for Music Theory

Running in Place: Sketches and Superimposition in Stravinsky's Music

Author(s): Gretchen Horlacher

Source: *Music Theory Spectrum*, Vol. 23, No. 2 (Autumn, 2001), pp. 196-216

Published by: University of California Press on behalf of the Society for Music Theory

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/745986>

Accessed: 18/01/2009 02:25

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/action/showPublisher?publisherCode=ucal>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit organization founded in 1995 to build trusted digital archives for scholarship. We work with the scholarly community to preserve their work and the materials they rely upon, and to build a common research platform that promotes the discovery and use of these resources. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



University of California Press and Society for Music Theory are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Music Theory Spectrum*.

Running in Place: Sketches and Superimposition in Stravinsky's Music

Gretchen Horlacher

I. CUT AND PASTE

"Here, you see, I cut off the fugue with a pair of scissors. . . . You can eliminate these harp-solo interruptions, paste the parts of the fugue together, and it will be one whole piece."¹

The quotation above refers to Stravinsky's 1947 ballet *Orpheus* and probably dates from around that time. It might not only be a symbolic description of Stravinsky's style, but also a literal description of his working method. Consider Example 1, my transcription of a draft from the first movement of *Symphony in Three Movements*, dating from the early 1940s.² Although the draft ap-

The author wishes to acknowledge the generosity of the Paul Sacher Foundation, Basel, in granting permission to reproduce the sketch transcriptions used in this article.

¹Nicolas Nabokov relates Stravinsky's description of the "Epilogue" from *Orpheus* in his essay "Christmas with Stravinsky" (Nabokov 1951, 204). His remembrance first appears in Corle 1949, 146. Thanks to Felix Meyer of the Paul Sacher Foundation for this reference.

²Because of Stravinsky's cut-and-paste working method, it is difficult to distinguish between a sketch and a draft; for the purposes of this paper, I will use "sketch" to mean a notation with ideas or fragments but no continuity over more than a few measures, and will use "draft" to mean a notation containing at least one continuous episode. This draft (and all the others transcribed in this paper) are part of the Stravinsky collection housed at the Paul Sacher Foundation in Basel, Switzerland, and are reproduced with their kind permission. The

pears to be continuous (the top-staff E-major chord at the end of the second system is tied to the first chord on the third system), it arises from the attachment of two pieces of paper: the bracket to the left of the draft (added by the author) identifies a cut piece of paper that has been taped onto a larger page with only the lowest system written on it. Even more intriguing is that the taped excerpt at the top is a carbon copy and the page to which it is attached is carbon paper. It seems that the composer made copies of his work-in-progress so that he could cut and paste them easily. In fact, many of the drafts for this portion of music were made on carbon paper that was subsequently separated and sometimes cut into pieces.

For a composer known to manipulate repeated fragments of music, such a working method comes as little surprise. The music in question, from R22 forward, is familiar territory. This passage exemplifies a common Stravinskian texture I call "running in place." In the first six measures of the draft, two repeating layers vie for attention: over G-major ostinati in upper and lower string parts (henceforth called the "strings layer") are superimposed

transcriptions have been reproduced by Juan Antonio Cuéllar, a doctoral composition student at the Indiana University School of Music, using Finale® software. The use of the Mistral font is meant to indicate locations where Stravinsky made annotations on the sketches by hand. I wish to thank Juan for his contribution. Any errors are my own.

Example 1. A “cut-and-paste” draft

The musical score is divided into two systems, each enclosed in a large bracket on the left. The first system contains three staves: *Winds*, *Horns*, and a piano section. The *Winds* staff has a treble clef and a key signature of one sharp (F#), with a tempo marking *MM.* and a metronome marking $\text{♩} = 58$. The *Horns* staff also has a treble clef and a key signature of one sharp, with a marking *3 Tpt.* below it. The piano section consists of four staves: *Vni* (Violin I), *Vla* (Viola), *Vc* (Cello), and *Cl* (Double Bass). The *Vni* and *Vla* staves are grouped together, and the *Vc* and *Cl* staves are grouped together. The piano section is marked *[pt. 1]*. The second system contains four staves: *Violins*, *Violas*, *Cellos*, and *Double Basses*. The *Violins* and *Violas* staves are grouped together, and the *Cellos* and *Double Basses* staves are grouped together. The second system is marked *[pt. 2]*. The score includes various musical notations such as chords, melodic lines, and dynamic markings like *etc.* and *Cal*. The page number *-2-* is located at the top right of the first system.

Example 1. [continued]

irregularly repeating major triads in woodwinds and horns (henceforth, the “horn layer”) with roots of $D\flat$ (spelled $C\sharp$ by Stravinsky), $E\flat$, and $E\sharp$. Each stratum exists both as a discrete unit whose pitch content and rhythmic profile is fixed, and as a member of a contrapuntal texture, affecting (and affected by) the repetitions of the other layer. In other words, while each stratum is essentially unchanged—it stays in place—the changing alignment of the two strata lends to the passage a sense of motion—of running. In this early draft, the passage runs through three small units: two introductory bars are followed by two episodes (mm. 3–5 and 6–8) delineated by the ongoing collisions of the two strata.³

A cut-and-paste method permitted Stravinsky to experiment with the lengths and ordering of the episodes, which is borne out in the sketch evidence. There are at least five versions of this passage created by cut-and-paste or similar methods, indicating that

³The final score for this passage is given as Example 7; in the draft (Example 1), the G-major ostinato is varied in mm. 5–6 and gives way to ostinati with other roots in mm. 7–8; in the final music the ostinato continues unaltered for much longer, a fact that will be central to my discussion of the excerpt.

Stravinsky was aware of the layering and ordering of the superimposed strata. Moreover, later versions are not only longer (consisting of more repetitions), but are also often distinguished by the insertion of additional reiterations from *within* the passage. That the repetitions do not arise in an additive manner is important: revision by interpolation suggests a conception of the passage as an entirety, and invites us to compare the newly created sequence of repetitions with previous, shorter versions. I will demonstrate both that the interpolations consist of previously “unused” contrapuntal alignments, and that the order Stravinsky chooses for the inserted music creates pitch motions reaching beyond those associated with the individual repetitions. Thus, the composer’s early drafts often mark out what will eventually become the beginning and ending points of a superimposed passage. The interpolations fill the interior of the passage by creating a series of episodes that lead from one repetition to the next. In other words, Stravinsky’s revisions are developmental, drawing individual repetitions into sequential connection with one another and transforming repetitions into an ordered, continuous passage.

Whether Stravinsky's superimposed textures are continuous has been a point of debate.⁴ Commentators commonly point to the unchanging register, timbre, pitch content, and rhythmic profiles of the constituent layers, suggesting either that they are unrelated, or that they exist in isolation. For example, Lynne Rogers argues that Stravinsky's layers often create a texture of "dissociation," a rejection of common-practice contrapuntal procedure in which "the audible separation of contrasting, superimposed layers . . . is primary, prohibiting the formation of a vertically unifying harmonic progression or pattern of simultaneities."⁵ While Rogers notes the frequent use of interpolation in her analysis of sketches from Stravinsky's Violin Concerto, she suggests that Stravinsky's revisions serve to separate layers more thoroughly from one another.⁶ Richard Taruskin argues that, in borrowing stylistic and structural features of Russian folk ostinato music, Stravinsky rejected Germanic symphonic practices bound to a continuity achieved through development, transformation, and the like, resulting in "hypostatization," in which the "fixity" of musical elements is juxtaposed with the "mutability" of their rhythmic presentation so that they "coexist in concurrent, independent strata."⁷ In other words, while strata coexist, they do not interact.⁸

Also drawing from the sketch evidence, Joseph Straus takes a different position, placing Stravinskian "moments" in larger con-

texts so that local discontinuities are balanced by linear and motivic connections across moments, movements, and even entire pieces.⁹ Like Straus, I agree that our best appreciation of this music relies on our conceptions of both its active and static profiles; however, I wish to demonstrate how connection comes *in the midst* of separation, how dynamic and static readings of the same passage may coexist. In each of the analyses below, I describe how superimposed layers interact in an ordered series of episodes, each of which arises as the strata collide. An episode exists as a sequential part of a larger section in that it may either initiate a pitch and/or rhythmic relationship between strata, or react to (or possibly complete) a relationship set forth in an earlier episode. Such harmonic/contrapuntal and rhythmic activities develop a passage by connecting one episode to another, even as each stratum maintains its discrete identity. In short, the episodic model engages both the number of repetitions a passage contains and the sequence in which they occur.¹⁰ This model suggests that superimposed passages are both dynamic and continuous: they move in a connected and ordered direction.

I describe below two examples of episodic development: the passage given as Example 1, and a passage from the third movement of the *Symphony of Psalms*. I trace the genesis of each passage from sketch through draft to final score. In each case, I identify how successive sketches and drafts grow from within, demonstrating how Stravinsky transformed an initial disposition

⁴In Horlacher 1992, I summarize the views of authors who emphasize the static and/or continuous nature of Stravinsky's invention, including Edward Cone, Pierre Boulez, Jonathan Kramer, and Pieter van den Toorn, and posit a model by which superimposed strata may interact contrapuntally.

⁵Rogers 1995, 476.

⁶In Rogers 1994, the author discusses a short example of Stravinsky's phrase expansion (in the violin concerto) as a typical procedure for the composer.

⁷Taruskin 1996, 957 and 961. His discussion on pp. 957–65 refers to innovations in *The Rite of Spring* that derive from Russian folk practice.

⁸This is essentially Boulez's point when he describes Stravinsky's superimposition as having "... no development, properly speaking, but only varied repetition, no chemical reaction, but only a physical mixing . . ." Boulez 1968, 62.

⁹In a paper entitled "The Stravinskian Moment," Straus recalls Jonathan Kramer's connection of Stockhausen's term with Stravinsky's music; although he is in large part referring not to Stravinsky's superimposed textures, but rather to the "block" constructions, the issue of continuity is equally pressing here. Van den Toorn 1987, Chapter 4, defines the two textures and their rhythmic/metric implications. Kramer's 1986 discussion appears on pp. 174–94.

¹⁰In Horlacher 1992, I have described a model of interacting superimposed strata called a "cycle." A cycle relies on continuous and fairly rigorous patterns of repetition for its existence. While the episodic model described here has similar roots (it relies on contrapuntal completion as a gauge), it can describe strata whose repetitions are more varied.

of fragments into a sequentially ordered passage.¹¹ I show how short drafts consisting merely of single iterations become fully-developed episodes that in turn become sections in which static elements are paradoxically made more active because they appear in constantly changing environments. In other words, each stratum follows its own pattern while also responding to the events around it. Stravinsky's superimposition results in both the juxtaposition and the development of strata into a carefully ordered sequence. The sketch material reveals the nature of that development.

II. SKETCHES AND STRETCHES

I begin with a well-known passage from the third movement of *Symphony of Psalms*, an orchestral interlude that initiates the second section of the work. The passage is constructed from three reiterating and superimposed strata, shown in Example 2(a). The example is formatted so that each system begins an episode, characterized by the ordered entrances of three strata. Entering first is a C-major triad in bassoon and horns; although the chord always repeats six times in eighth notes, this pattern itself does not appear regularly.¹² The chord figure is accompanied by a bass line

in lower strings moving in quarter notes on the three ordered pitches F#, G, and A♭; while these repetitions are initially broken by rests, they soon become an ongoing ostinato.¹³

The most irregular stratum is the trumpet melody, entering first at the sixth measure after R3, the end of the second episode. Like the C-major chord, this melody appears irregularly; additionally, while the trumpet always begins on G and moves in quarter notes thereafter, the three statements of its four ordered pitches (G, B♭, A♭, and C) each differ in length. All three strata—C-major chord, bass line, trumpet melody—share pitch-class G and, taken together, emphasize C and G as centric, thereby continuing C's dominance from the previous, initial choral statement.¹⁴ The patterns in these three strata remain intact through the trumpet's third statement (during episode four). As the patterns are broken, the centricity of C also gives way.

contrast with the previous majestic and reverent choral "laude dominum." Shortly after the orchestral interlude, the chorus does, in fact, adopt the horn's rhythm. Although Stravinsky claimed that the six eighth-note iterations were the composer's first notation for the whole of the *Symphony of Psalms* (see Stravinsky & Craft 1968, 44), subsequent discussion in this paper will show that this is not the case.

¹³In the third episode, the bassline enters jointly with the horns. Because it becomes an unbroken ostinato thereafter, it appears to overtake the chord at the start of the fourth measure. Although there has been one break in this bassline at the downbeat of rehearsal 4, its continuation follows as if the missing pitch (G) had been present. As we shall see, this rest occurs in all strata and serves to separate one episode from the next.

¹⁴Despite its new texture and tempo, this second section of the movement is closely connected to the opening of the movement. The C-major chord continues C's role as a focal pitch, the lower strings ostinato derives from a G–A♭ ostinato in the horns early in the movement (this ostinato is itself a reference to the alto chant early in the first movement), and the trumpet melody refers to the repeated "laude dominum" melody that closes the first section. A portion of this melody also appears as a superimposed ostinato in the tenor and bass parts near the start of the movement. In other words, while contrasting in character, the strata in the second section restate ostinati and repeating strata from earlier music.

¹¹In their essay describing revisions made to *Symphonies of Wind Instruments*, André Baltensperger and Felix Meyer discuss interpolation as a compositional procedure for this work; see p. 30 of the 1991 Paul Sacher Foundation publication of the 1920 score of *Symphonies of Wind Instruments*. The reader can find a reproduction of a sketch (as opposed to a transcription) showing a typical "internal expansion" on p. 40 of the same work. Another sketch with an internal expansion from the same work may be found on plate 9 in Stravinsky & Craft 1978. I have found similar sketches in all three of Stravinsky's "style periods" and am currently studying expansions in the *Symphonies*, a work characterized by blocks more often than by superimposition.

¹²Erick Walter White 1979, 363, connects the six eighths in the horn with the six syllables of the movement's central text (from Psalm 150) "laude dominum" and interprets them as a joyous and ultimately raucous interpretation of the text; the orchestral interlude from which the horn part is taken forms a

Example 2(a). Four episodes beginning at R3 in the *Symphony of Psalms*, III. (b) Bass-trumpet counterpoints.

(a)

(a)

R3

Episode 1

bassoon,
horns

lower
strings

trumpet

Episode 2

R4

Episode 3

pno.

Episode 4

etc.

*
break

The musical score consists of four episodes, each with a treble and bass staff. Episode 1 (R3) features bassoon/horns in the treble and lower strings in the bass. Episode 2 features trumpet in the treble and bassoon/horns in the bass. Episode 3 features trumpet in the treble and bassoon/horns in the bass. Episode 4 features piano in the treble and bassoon/horns in the bass. Arrows labeled X, Y, Z, and V indicate counterpoint relationships between the episodes. A break symbol is at the end of Episode 4.

Example 2. [continued]

(b)



Thus, while each stratum is well defined by its instrumentation, register, durational identity, and pitch content, it does not exist in isolation. Rather, Example 2(a) demonstrates the participation of each line in a larger formal framework consisting of four episodes. The example shows that while the strata initially enter separately, the entrances become closer in each successive entrance and eventually overlap. As a consequence, the episodes become denser. Thus, in the first episode, only two strata are present and each appears on its own, separated by a half-note rest. The C-major triad also initiates episode two, this time followed by lower strings after a quarter-note rest. As this line becomes an ostinato, it is augmented by another chordal entrance and the first statement of the trumpet melody. In the third episode, the chord and bass line enter together with the trumpet following shortly thereafter. In the last episode, the bass line overtakes the chord, and all three strata have entered by the end of the first measure.¹⁵ As a whole, the passage gathers momentum with the increasingly compact entrances, counteracting the static construction of its constituent parts.¹⁶

¹⁵Although appearing earlier in each reiteration, the trumpet always retains its notated metrical identity. If the half note can be counted as a tactus in this passage (one of several possibilities), the trumpet always enters on its weaker quarter and closes on its stronger one. As will be described below, this reading enhances the possibility that the trumpet may close an episode.

¹⁶Pieter van den Toorn analyzes this passage as representative of his rhythmic type two, where energy accumulates as the horn fragment is metrically reinterpreted from an “upbeating” reiteration to one appearing on the downbeat. See van den Toorn 1983, 233–4.

Pitch events also lead the passage forward. The C-centric identity of the passage arises not only from the intonation of a C-major triad, but also from the interaction of the other two strata, whose melodic constructions give rise to a two-part counterpoint. The vertical lines drawn on Example 2(a) connect the first pitch of each trumpet statement (G) with its corresponding bass line counterpart; because the bass melody has three pitches for every four in the trumpet, only three counterpoints are possible between these two strata and are labeled X, Y, and Z in Example 2(b). Note that the passage moves through all three possible combinations (although not continuously) before repeating the initial one.

The passage begins and ends with version X with good reason, for this particular alignment stands out as more consonant than the other two. By defining triadic intervals (thirds/sixths, fifths/fourths) as consonant and other intervals as dissonant,¹⁷ and by hearing C and G as privileged within the total pitch content, we may favor counterpoint X tonally over counterpoints Y and Z. For while Y and Z have vertical minor seconds and a tritone (between pitches C and F# in Z), version X begins on the single shared pitch, G, has comparatively mild dissonances of a major second, and ends on C and G at its close. Neither versions Y nor Z pair either G with C or either of the two pitches with itself.

Taken as a whole, then, the passage completes all possible trumpet/strings alignments and favors the most consonant one (version X) as a point of departure and return. The internal ordering and pacing of the counterpoints also connect one episode with another. During their first encounter at the end of episode two, trumpet and contrabass cycle through versions X and Y, stopping on the pitches C and A♭. The episode is curtly cut off by the following syncopated accent on the bass's F# and a subsequent silence, events that demand continuation of some kind. At episode 3, the melodic pair resumes and completes the interrupted contrapuntal pairing, moving through version Z and continuing forward

¹⁷In this high neoclassical work, it seems appropriate to borrow this basic model to distinguish vertical consonance from dissonance.

to repeat version X, the privileged counterpoint capable of creating harmonic closure. However, Stravinsky truncates the trumpet melody one pitch too soon on A \flat (note the missing C at the start of episode 4), once more averting closure and intensifying our expectations for another episode.

Episode 4 is a culmination of the passage for several reasons. First, all three fragments overlap for the first time, with the bass and trumpet fragments aligned in privileged counterpoint X. Second, Stravinsky adds at the beginning of the episode an additional C-major chord in the piano, which is emphasized by a metrically offset entrance on a weak eighth note. Only when the succession of two-part counterpoints has unfolded completely and returned to its starting point, X, and when all three strata enter nearly concurrently do the patterns in each stratum begin to break.

We turn now to the sketches, noting their relationships with the finished episodic form described above. Example 3 is the first extant draft for this passage, found on pages 10–11 in a sketchbook Stravinsky used for all three movements of the piece.¹⁸ For the moment, I will consider only its lower continuous system, returning to the additional measures shown on the upper right hand side (the first “stretching” of the passage) shortly. In this first draft Stravinsky has already chosen the three strata, although they appear in much less distinctive forms: the C-major chord appears continuously in undifferentiated quarter notes, and the bass line, while

also continuous, is rather disjunct, appearing as short fragments in two registers, which obscures its identity as a repeating melody. There is only one trumpet entrance. Without their final rhythmic identities or multiple repetitions, the strata do not appear as three independent, superimposed fragments. Moreover, this initial draft is lacking a fully episodic structure, giving way rather soon to the following music; note that the ostinati have already broken their patterns in the third notated measure of the sketch. Instead of the superimposed strata and episodic structure of the final version, the sketch outlines a single passage in which concurrent beginnings in the first two strata are followed by one trumpet statement and an immediate demarcated close in the form of a syncopated C-major chord in upper strings, which will become the piano chord in the final episode.

The additional measures Stravinsky adds to the start of the passage (by way of his arrow on Example 3) stretch it in important ways. First, note that the C-major triad, although still continuous, gains its eighth-note motion (albeit in alternating thirds); more importantly, additional lower-register entrances on C differentiate certain eighths, marking what will eventually become entrances in this stratum. Stravinsky's placement of this new material at the head of the passage also solidifies the role of the chord as initiator. In other words, with the addition of these introductory measures, the excerpt begins to acquire its constituent parts.

In Example 4, which also contains an intriguing internal “stretch,” Stravinsky transforms the excerpt into an ordered, cumulative structure.¹⁹ Even without the later expansion shown at top right, the draft shown on the lower system is very similar to the final version, for each of the strata has been transformed into a self-standing part of the texture: the C-major chord is no longer

¹⁸All the extant sketch material for the *Symphony of Psalms* is found in a bound notebook with blank pages and labeled on its cover “Igor Stravinsky SYMPHONY OF PSALMS ROUGH SKETCHES PENCIL MANUSCRIPT.” Stravinsky used a rastral to draw staves on the blank pages as needed. According to sporadic dates throughout the notebook, the composer appears to have filled it sequentially; the first date in the sketchbook is Dec. 29, [1929], and the last is Aug. 15, 1930. Material for the third movement fills pp. 8–37 and consists in large part of a continuous draft for the whole movement with sketches and smaller drafts appearing above, below, or around the longer draft. Page 8 shows a date of March 10. Pages 10–11 and 14–15 are the only pages with material for this part of the movement. The drafts for my transcriptions (Examples 4 and 5) have been reproduced in Horlacher 1999.

¹⁹Example 5 is taken from pp. 14–15 of the sketchbook. The intervening pages between Examples 4 and 5, pp. 12–13, contain only material related to music earlier in the movement. Pages 14–15 also show a reduced version of the first six measures shown in Example 5; the only difference is the addition of the sustained chord in fuller instrumentation (including upper strings), which does not alter the episodic structure.

Example 3. Early draft of R3

The musical score for Example 3, an early draft of R3, is presented on five staves. The top two staves are for a woodwind instrument, with a large curved line spanning across them. The third staff is for a trumpet, with a 'Th' marking. The fourth staff is for a violin, with 'vln' markings. The fifth staff is for a cello/bass, with 'VC' and 'CB' markings. The score includes various musical notations such as notes, rests, and dynamic markings like 'gub.' and 'gub.'.

continuous, entering instead at irregular durational intervals; the bass line has assumed its final registral position; and the trumpet melody has multiple entrances. As a whole, the draft without its internal expansion makes good sense on its own: the entrance pattern of the three fragments is intact, and the bass line ostinato continues uninterrupted. In fact, this draft corresponds to episodes one, two, and four of the final score.

The inserted measures on the upper right side of Example 4 must, of course, then be episode three. Stravinsky's last major revision was therefore to stretch the passage from within by adding to it these three additional measures. In what ways does the addition of episode three enhance the continuity of the whole? First, it is during this episode that the version Z counterpoint appears, an alignment that would otherwise never have taken place. But

Example 4. Subsequent draft of R3 with an internal insertion

The musical score for Example 4 consists of five staves. The top two staves are for strings or woodwinds. The bottom three staves are for TRBE, TUBA, and VC. The VC staff also includes a 'SUB.' line. The music is in 2/4 time and features complex rhythmic patterns, including triplets and sixteenth notes. Handwritten annotations include 'PIZZ DIU MARC.' above the VC staff, '4 cr.' below it, and 'VC+CB PIZZ' above the TUBA staff. A bracket labeled '(VC + CB PIZZ - UNISSONO)' spans the first two measures of the bottom staves. Dynamics include 'p SUB.', 'sf', and 'f'. A large bracket connects the top two staves to the VC staff, indicating a superimposition or internal insertion.

episode three provides more than completed superimposition: when Stravinsky cuts off the trumpet melody on A \flat (rather than C) at the end of the episode, he forestalls closure, thereby lengthening the passage and giving it a more dramatic conclusion.

The successive revisions documented in the sketches enhance both the static and the forward-reaching characteristics of the pas-

sage: they show how each stratum gained a distinctive, unchanging identity, and also how mere superimposition grew into a series of ordered episodes created by the interactions of those strata. While each stratum reiterates its own gesture, it also engages in a three-part counterpoint where pitch relations and texture combine, allowing us to hear the passage running in place.

III. STRAVINSKY'S SNIPS

Let us now return to the first movement of the *Symphony in Three Movements*. In this composition, Stravinsky edited and revised his work in some novel ways. While retaining the stretching method, he also made some sketches on carbon paper, creating a second copy to cut, paste, or staple to other versions. Additionally, Stravinsky often returned to the original carbon paper for additional edits, which can be compared with the original—and unedited—carbon copy. These methods leave a “paper trail” which can be used to trace how repetitions combine to create a continuous, connected form.²⁰

First, let us consider the large organization of the excerpt in its final form. Example 5 summarizes three different superimpositions, each of which plays out in a series of episodes like those in the *Symphony of Psalms* excerpt.²¹ Stravinsky developed all three sections similarly by interpolating repetitions within the outer boundaries marked by his original sketches. In fact, we can see a simple example of a cut-and-paste expansion in the figure from Example 5, part 2, by returning for a moment to Example 1. Recall that its upper two systems belonged originally to a previous

Example 5. Three superimpositions from *Symphony in Three Movements*, I. © 1946 Associated Music Publishers, Inc., New York. © Assigned to B. Schott's Söhne, Mainz. © Renewed. All rights reserved. Used by permission of EUROPEAN AMERICAN MUSIC DISTRIBUTORS LLC, sole U.S. and Canadian Agent for B. Schott's Söhne, Mainz

part 1: (R22)

part 2: (R26)

part 3: (R29)

²⁰The materials discussed here are unbound and undated; my chronology is based on tracing the emergence of the passage from a short fragment to its final published version. Most of the materials appear on single sheets of prelined staff paper (sometimes cut, as described below). An exception is Example 10, which shows an excerpt taken from a larger unlined sheet of paper to which Stravinsky added staff notation with a rastral. Additional materials on this page as well as other untranscribed music show later parts of the passage not discussed here.

²¹Taken as a whole, these three superimpositions (from R22 through R33) form a closing part of the initial section of the movement, appearing from the movement's opening through R38. The first superimposition (part one at R22) begins with prominent statements of G-major and D \flat -major triads forming the octatonic collection {1,2,4,5,7,8,A,B}; after a move toward the octatonic collection {0,1,3,4,6,7,9,A} at the end of part one, part two reinstates the original collection. The passage culminates on an E-minor triad at part 3 (R29), also a member of the original collection.

page, which is the earliest draft I have found for this music. In Example 6, I have reconstructed this earlier music, reuniting the two upper systems of Example 1 with their previous lower system. (Thus, Examples 1 and 6 differ only in their lowest systems.) Like the earliest drafts for *Symphony of Psalms*, Example 6 shows all three sections of the passage occurring in order (shown by the circled text), but in very short versions. For instance, the superimposition of part 2 (characterized by its four triads with roots of E, E♭, E, and G) consists merely of one two-measure unit; but when Stravinsky cut the upper two-thirds of this page and pasted it onto paper with a new lower system, producing Example 1, he expanded that portion of the excerpt. We can find a second iteration of the part-two fragment (in three measures, and with the substitution of a D♭ triad for the first triad) on the bottom of Example 1 at the asterisk.

The entire evolution of the passage cannot be traced in the present format; however, because the sketch evidence is so rich for the part-one superimposition, I will summarize various dramatic steps in its growth. In its final disposition, this passage consists of five episodes, each of which begins a system on Example 7. Episodes 2–5 are marked by the conjunction of a horn-layer repetition (consisting most typically of four ordered major triads with roots of D♭, E♭, E♯, and E♭) with two string ostinati that repeat the pitches G–B every two quarter notes and a G-major triad every three eighths. The first episode is introductory, and will be considered shortly.

Taken as a whole, all five episodes move between two octatonic collections, a process common to the entire first movement.²² Asterisks in Example 7 (at the start of episode two, where the two strata first interact, and at the end of episode five, as the passage ends) identify two Petrouchka-like chords that frame the passage,

each belonging to a different octatonic collection. Episodes 2–5 *begin* with a version of the chord belonging to the octatonic collection {1,2,4,5,7,8,A,B} that arises from the conjunction of the G-major figuration in the strings and the initial D♭-major triad in the horns. They *end*, however, with horns on an E♭-major triad, whose root is notably *not* part of this collection. (The end of the second episode is an exception to be described momentarily).²³ By the end of the *last* episode (see the third measure after R25), the bass ostinato finally gives up G for A, meeting the horn's E♭-major triad with a tritone-related pitch and thereby implicating another octatonic collection, {0,1,3,4,6,7,9,A}. G♯ reappears in the next measure, returning the passage to its original octatonic collection and initiating the second part of this passage, which consists of another series of episodes.

While it may appear sudden, the break in the bass-line ostinato can be attributed to its ongoing interactions with the horn layer in each successive episode; in other words, we can follow a path of interaction—of running—through the five episodes. The varied counterpoint between the horn and bass line prepares, or even forces, the bass line to move up a step, meeting the horn layer's E♭ triad, and thereby ending this superimposition. Each episode directs this process a little further, which we can trace in Example 7. The first episode, which occurs in every sketch or draft, is a two-measure statement of the string layer alone, showing its role as a point of both harmonic and rhythmic departure. Taken together, the two ostinati of three eighths (in the upper strings) and four eighths (in the lower strings) spin out a counterpoint that repeats every twelve eighths. In the context of the preceding three-four meter, the strings complete this cycle in two measures; consequently, the two measures of this initial episode form a unit by

²²Pieter van den Toorn demonstrates that movement from one octatonic or octatonic/diatonic passage to another (joined by common-tone transitional passages) is common in the first movement; see his analysis in van den Toorn 1983, 351–64.

²³It might seem unusual that the concatenation of triads whose roots are related by tritone (those on G and D♭) is considered more fundamental to the passage than those with roots a major third apart (G and E♭, sharing the common tone G.) The octatonic collection is so pervasive in this movement, however, that it serves as a referential collection.

Example 6. A reconstruction of the first draft for R22.

The musical score is written for a symphony orchestra. The top system includes staves for Winds, Horns, Violins (pt. 1), Viola, Violoncello (VC), and Contrabass (CB). The Winds and Horns parts are in treble clef, while the Violins, Viola, VC, and CB are in bass clef. The score is in 2/4 time, marked MM. (Moderato). The key signature has one sharp (F#). The first system ends with a double bar line and a repeat sign. The second system, labeled 'pt. 2', continues the music. The Winds and Horns parts are in treble clef, while the Violins, Viola, VC, and CB are in bass clef. The score is in 2/4 time, marked MM. (Moderato). The key signature has one sharp (F#). The first system ends with a double bar line and a repeat sign. The second system, labeled 'pt. 2', continues the music. The Winds and Horns parts are in treble clef, while the Violins, Viola, VC, and CB are in bass clef. The score is in 2/4 time, marked MM. (Moderato). The key signature has one sharp (F#). The first system ends with a double bar line and a repeat sign. The second system, labeled 'pt. 2', continues the music.

Example 6. [continued]

which we can measure the repetitions of the string layer and the movement of the counterpointing horn layer.

The first few episodes begin and end concurrently with the string cycle. Like episode one, episode two (the first superimposition of strings and horn) lasts just two measures—that is, for one string cycle. Although the horn layer enters “properly” as a string cycle begins, it is then awkwardly cut off: after a long $D\flat$ triad, its two final eighths (containing $E\flat$ and E triads) seem to lean forward toward a goal without reaching it. This opening disposition of the two layers establishes the dominance of the string layer and the octatonic collection $\{1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 8, A, B\}$ and is reinforced in the third episode. Here, the horn layer enters as an interrupting syncopation two quarters after the episode begins. This time, the “leaning” eighths do reach a suitably long $E\flat$ triad (a sonority whose root is outside the octatonic collection) in the third measure of the episode. This gesture causes the string cycle to begin again, adding a third measure to the episode. The second cycle continues forward to its end at the fourth measure of the episode, even though the horn fragment is complete in the third measure. In

Example 7. The first five episodes of R22 in the *Symphony in Three Movements*, I. Used by permission of EUROPEAN AMERICAN MUSIC DISTRIBUTORS LLC

Episode 1

Episode 2

octatonic collection $\{1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 8, A, B\}$ does not include $E\flat$ triad!

Example 7. [continued]

Episode 3

Episode 4

Episode 5

R23 R24

R25 R26

* etc.

new octatonic collection:
{0, 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 9, A}

return of G:
start of part 2

other words, the string layer delays the start of another horn repetition by a measure.

The fourth episode mimics the third with its late, interrupting horn entrance. But here the balance of power begins to shift, for when the horn layer completes its melodic statement, it moves immediately into the fifth episode, effectively interrupting the completion of the string cycle (indicated by the X through the “missing” fourth measure of episode four). In fact, it is at the end of the fourth episode that the bass-line ostinato first begins to give way, moving to a previously unheard G_4 before returning to its normal G_3 – B_3 repetitions. We have already seen that in the fifth episode, the bass line moves from G up to A, giving up one octatonic collection for another; notice that in this final episode, the horn layer enters concurrently on the first downbeat of the episode and sustains its final E_b -major triad for a full two measures, seeming to wait while the bass line moves upward.

I have cast the two layers as competitors in order to demonstrate their relationship over the five ordered episodes. As with the *Symphony of Psalms* example, these essentially static layers interact: the unpredictable entrances of the horn layer interrupt the stable statements of the string cycle until the predictable repetitions of the cycle give way, enacting a move from one octatonic collection to another. While the two layers remain essentially intact throughout the passage, they are aligned so as to create episodes characterized by an increasing sense of tonal conflict that is resolved by the change in the string cycle.

The five extant drafts for this passage reinforce a conception of the passage both as episodic and as consecutive, for they trace a sequence of events in which Stravinsky consistently lengthens the passage from within. Let us reconsider Example 6, my reconstruction of an early draft. Note that it contains both the “outer” episodes 1 and 5 (that is, the opening two-measure string cycle and the change of bass ostinato from G to A, shown here as mm. 6–8) as well as a single “inner” episode (mm. 3–5 of this draft). Although this inner episode lacks a syncopated start, its three-

measure length and bass-line leap to an upper G make it resemble the final-version episode 4. In other words, this early draft (maintained in Example 1, the subsequent draft) corresponds to the final episodes 1, 4, and 5. Already the constituent strata have taken on distinctive shapes, and the passage's larger pitch motion is supported by smaller episodes. Stravinsky continues to develop the material over several more drafts.

The reader will recall that Example 1 is a carbon copy; Example 8 is the original carbon paper from which it is made.²⁴ On it, Stravinsky makes one small but significant change before recasting the passage on another sheet of paper; following the last episode of part one (my episode 5), he changes the bass line from A_b to G (see m. 9 of Example 8), reasserting the original octatonic collection and initiating the next section of music.²⁵ By returning the bass line to G in the next section, Stravinsky highlights the arrival on A at the end of the first section. Also new are the numbers “1234” in red, a shorthand I will discuss below.

The sketch shown in Example 9, Stravinsky's third attempt, consists only of a small piece of paper that appears at one point to have been stapled onto Example 8, and for this reason I have aligned the start of Example 8 above it. Consisting of just three measures, Example 9 has two intriguing annotations above it.²⁶ The first, “changed fourth measure,” most likely refers to the fourth

²⁴This “original” consists of two outer staves drawn on a blank piece of paper with a blank middle space left open. My reconstruction shows that the music was taped onto this middle space, and the contents were therefore reproduced onto the carbon copy shown in Example 1 before being removed for reasons unclear to me. (The taped middle staff now exists as a separate sketch, but its shape matches Example 8 exactly; Example 8 also shows tape marks corresponding to the smaller middle piece.) I can only speculate that Stravinsky expected to insert material within Example 8 and therefore drew it with space to accommodate such an insertion.

²⁵The changed bassline is retained in the final version; see the end of episode 5 on Example 7 (R26), final score.

²⁶The notations have been translated from Russian to English on the transcription.

Example 8. Original, edited draft of Example 1's carbon copy

Handwritten musical score for Example 8, featuring staves for Winds, Horns, Vni/Vla, VC, and CB. The score is written in a draft style with various annotations and markings.

Winds: The top staff shows a melodic line with a long note, followed by a rest, and then a series of chords. A "-2-" marking is at the end of the staff.

Horns: The second staff shows a melodic line with a long note, followed by a rest, and then a series of chords. A "3 7₄" marking is below the staff.

Vni/Vla: The third staff shows a melodic line with a long note, followed by a rest, and then a series of chords. A "3 7₄" marking is below the staff.

VC: The fourth staff shows a melodic line with a long note, followed by a rest, and then a series of chords.

CB: The fifth staff shows a melodic line with a long note, followed by a rest, and then a series of chords.

MM: A marking "MM." is present above the Horns staff, with "♩ = 58" below it.

Other markings: The score includes various musical notations such as notes, rests, and accidentals. There are also some handwritten annotations like "etc" and "Col" with a triangle above it.

Example 8. [continued]

Example 8, continued, shows three staves of music. The top staff features a single melodic line with various chords and a long tied note. The middle and bottom staves provide a piano accompaniment with eighth and sixteenth notes. A '4' is written above the first measure of the piano part. The piece concludes with a double bar line and repeat dots.

Example 9. Short sketch originally stapled to Example 8

Example 9 is a short sketch originally stapled to Example 8. It consists of two systems of staves. The first system shows a treble and bass staff. The second system shows a 'changed 4th bar' and an 'insertion' in the piano part. Arrows indicate the relationship between the sketch and the previous example.

measure of the previous draft (Example 8); the notation seems to indicate that horns should continue sustaining the D \flat -major triad for another measure. Following this notation is the word “insertion.” Here, I believe that Stravinsky intended to insert an episode within Example 8, one that would follow the just-lengthened D \flat -major triad. In fact, the composer’s next draft, shown in Example 10, shows such a reconstruction. Beginning on the *lower* three systems, it contains the initial two-measure cycle followed by a lengthened two-measure D \flat triad in the horns, and then the inserted measures from Example 8. This internal expansion has striking consequences: it creates two additional episodes resembling the final episodes 2 and 3. The red numbers “1234” also reappear on Example 10, Stravinsky’s shorthand from Example 8 indicating that the end of the fifth and final episode (as well as the start of the part-two superimposition) should appear here. (The music on the *upper* three systems continues the part-two superimposition.)

The draft in Example 10 is nearly identical with the final version; below the example in brackets are my notations showing each episode’s beginning for easy comparison with the final score in Example 7. All that remained was to alter episode 2 from its rather lifeless single D \flat triad to the more engaging statement in which the horn line introduces its “leaning” E \flat -major and E-major triads. In his fifth consideration of the passage, shown in Example 11, Stravinsky transformed episode two into its final form.

It appears that Stravinsky was very and perhaps even obsessively careful with the ordering and alignment of these strata. After all, the music in question consists of a mere fourteen measures of fifteen seconds’ duration. It would be easy to dismiss it as only another static texture for which the composer is so famous, and, indeed, the individual repetitions of each layer are one important component of it. But the texture is not entirely static, and most of Stravinsky’s revisions work towards gradually breaking off the established regularity of the bass line from its G–B repetitions to G–G and eventually to A \flat and A, a move counterpointed by the appearance of the E \flat triad above it. That break is also connected

with the growing interruptions in the horn layer against the predictable rhythmic reiterations in the strings.²⁷

I began this article by describing Stravinsky’s textures as “running in place,” which is to say that when motivic fragments whose repetitions “stay in place” are superimposed on one another, they “run” through a sequence of events. The power of these textures arises from the forward motion that ensues in these essentially fixed and repeating strata. The sketch evidence shows the composer’s concern for both sides of the issue: his initial conceptions consisted of the fragments themselves; he developed them not only through additional repetitions, but also from newly created alignments. Stravinsky followed a similar routine in both these pieces: the early sketches show the outer boundaries of a superimposition—that is, an initial layering of fragments and a disbanding of that texture. Subsequent revisions comprise new superimpositions, located within the boundaries of the composer’s pre-existing work. From these revisions arise new sequences of events, organizations best described as series of episodes that endow a superimposed passage with a beginning, a continuation, and an appropriate dissolution, even as the constituent strata consistently repeat the same material. From this juxtaposition of repetition and motion comes the unique dynamism characteristic of much of Stravinsky’s music.

²⁷This discussion has focused only on the development of part one into a fourteen-measure segment; drafts indicate that Stravinsky was simultaneously lengthening parts 2 and 3 of the passage, again by inserting material within their boundaries. In fact, part 2 also grows to fourteen measures, matching the length of part one.

Example 10. A draft that combines features of Examples 8 and 9

episodes: [1] [2] [3] [4] [5]

LIST OF WORKS CITED

- Baltensperger, André and Felix Meyer. 1991. "Commentary." In *Symphonies of Wind Instruments*, 25–38. Basel: Paul Sacher Foundation.
- Boulez, Pierre. 1968. *Notes of an Apprenticeship*. Translated by Herbert Weinstock. New York: Knopf.
- Corle, Edwin, ed. 1949. *Igor Stravinsky*. New York: Duell, Sloan, and Pearce.

- Horlacher, Gretchen. 1992. "The Rhythms of Reiteration: Formal Development in Stravinsky's Ostinati." *Music Theory Spectrum* 14: 171–87.
- . 1999. "Sketches and Superimposition in Stravinsky's *Symphony of Psalms*." *Mitteilungen der Paul Sacher Stiftung* 12 (April): 22–6.
- Kramer, Jonathan. 1986. "Discontinuity and Proportion in the Music of Stravinsky." In *Confronting Stravinsky*. Edited by Jann Pasler. Berkeley: University of California Press. 174–94.

Example 11. A draft with the final episode two

Nabokov, Nicolas. 1951. *Old Friends and New Music*. Boston: Little Brown.

Rogers, Lynne. 1994. "Varied Repetition and Stravinsky's Compositional Process." *Mitteilungen der Paul Sacher Stiftung* 7 (April): 22–6.

———. 1995. "Stravinsky's Break with Contrapuntal Tradition: A Sketch Study." *Journal of Musicology* 13: 476–507.

Straus, Joseph. 2000. "The Stravinskian Moment." Paper presented at the February meeting of the Indiana University Graduate Theory Association Music Theory Symposium, Bloomington.

Stravinsky, Igor, and Robert Craft. 1968. *Dialogues and a Diary*. London: Faber and Faber.

Stravinsky, Vera, and Robert Craft. 1978. *Stravinsky in Pictures and Documents*. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Taruskin, Richard. 1996. *Stravinsky and the Russian Traditions*. Vol. 1. Berkeley: University of California Press.

van den Toorn, Pieter. 1983. *The Music of Igor Stravinsky*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

———. 1987. *Stravinsky and "The Rite of Spring"*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

White, Erick Walter. 1979. *Stravinsky The Composer and His Works*. Second edition. Berkeley: University of California Press.

ABSTRACT

This article considers Stravinsky's use of superimposed, repeating motivic fragments from the perspective of his sketches and drafts. It describes a common procedure where sketches with single statements of fragments are expanded by the insertion of repetitions from within. Thus, the repetitions originate as interpolations rather than additions, becoming members of a larger formal framework. The paper describes how the fragments may interact contrapuntally to create a series of ordered episodes that counteract their reiterative origins. It considers sketches from *Symphony of Psalms* and *Symphony in Three Movements*.