

There are especially three statements which I wish to make the main issues of the present discussion.

The first would be that the Sonata-form is the standard form of tonality and as such bound to the conditions of tonality. As tonality or tonal music I am comprehending the music inaugurated in Western Europe about 1600. ~~The~~^{Its} main criteria should be definite major- and minor-keys and its harmonic organization through the dominant-effect and the tonal cadence.

By the second thesis I wish to point out that the efforts of resolving the problem of the form ~~in~~ in the realm of atonality by reestablishing the Sonata-form or other traditional forms failed to reach their aim. (necessarity)

Thirdly, I will try to demonstrate that only the twelve-tone technique was able to ~~offer~~ furnish new means for developing a new and adequate idea of the form.

In referring to number one, I think I can be very brief. History proves that the Sonata-form is connected with tonality in the above mentioned sense, as the Sonata-form did not develop before the 18th century, 100 years after the establishment of tonality. The same is proved by the analysis of the formal idea of the sonata. ~~This idea~~ ^(this idea) means establishment and resolution of the tension between the two polarically opposed zones of Tonic and Dominant through the medium of the Subdominant. As all these three harmonic ^{mainly} elements are not conceivable outside of tonality it is clear that the Sonata-form itself is possible only as far as the principles of tonality are ruling. Tonic, Dominant and Subdominant are the essential elements of the tonal cadence which I consider ~~as~~ as the sym-bolic model of all possibilities of tonal music. From the simple eight-measure period to the monumental dimensions of a huge symphony everything in tonality can be explained as a more and more extended presentation of the tonal cadence.

It is true that the appearance of the post-classical sonatas, for instance the symphonies of Muzler and Mahler, seem to escape this scheme ~~if~~ ^{analytical} be found in the fact that tonality in reaching its acme in the Sonata-form created the germ provoking its slow but unavoidable decomposition. The development-part of the Sonata where the return from the Dominant-region to the Tonic is performed needed increasingly ~~more~~ harmonic steps remote from the primitive key, and the practice of working up the thematic material by dramatic gestures, in connection with the growing dimensions, led to the necessity of developing the remote harmonic elements ~~in~~ in whole interpolated sections declaring the temporary domination of foreign keys. Finally also the basic steps of Dominant and Subdominant are often replaced by the Mediant or the mirror-parallel or some other steps. Franz Schubert, although in the close neighborhood of Beethoven, was the first to widen the tonal unity of the Sonata-form quite unexpectedly, and many of the phenomena which signify the disintegration of the Sonata-form in the later 19th century ~~can be attributed~~ have their origin in Schubert's remarkable boldness.

The evolution of tonality in the late romanticism led to ~~a~~ a state of the musical language which under certain assumptions can be called atonality. I believe it was especially the increasing use of intermediate dominants which weakened the key-consciousness in such a degree that finally the key ~~is~~ as the principle of order disappeared completely. There are already in Wagner many recitatives anticipating this evolution completed afterwards by his followers. Arnold Schoenberg was the first to write deliberately atonal music, some 30^{odd} years ago. It seems to me that he did not face at once the consequences involved by his step in regard of the form. Anyway he did not even try to ~~not~~ continue sonata-writing, maybe ~~more~~ guided more by instinct than by well-established insight. The first exhibits of atonal music are Schoenberg's piano-pieces op. 11. With respect to the formal conception, they are linked with the tradition by the prevailing use of the three-part form of the classical Andante-movement. I wish to play as example the first of these three pieces.

(E) There are obviously three parts, the last one recapitulating the first one without the small development section following the first establishment of the theme. Instead of it there is a coda which finishes the piece. In the classical model of this form the middle part would require a new theme in a different key, the dominant or the major or minor variant of the main tonality or something similar. By such means the middle part is contrasted to the two other parts. As in Schoenberg's piece no definite key is ruling in the first and the third part it is obviously not possible to build up the contrast of the middle part by the change of the tonality. In fact, the contrast is created only by the character of the middle part: thorough-going quick movement instead of the broadly extended lines of the other parts, less thematic consistence than in the other sections. Yet, by creating the contrast in this way Schoenberg ^(does not) ~~reconciles~~ ~~not~~ only the change of tonality (which to do he is compelled by having voted for atonality), but also the idea of confronting two ^{decidedly} ~~opposed~~ different themes which was not at all necessary. On the contrary, the middle part is even very much ~~not~~ related with the thematic material of the main part. There is not only the idea of the quick movement anticipated, but nearly everything what is going on in this middle part turns out to be a sort of development of the opening motive of the whole piece. I believe ~~that~~ the reason for this formal arrangement was that the intention of creating a clear ABA form was overshadowed by the care of securing a clearer structural unity within a musical language deprived of the implements which used to provide unity in the former tonal language.

This intention of establishing a most striking unity is the guiding principle of Schoenberg's creative mind altogether. Himself says in a most interesting letter ^{when} dealing with the origin of the twelve-tone technique: "I was ^(to Mr. Hornimsky published in his book 'Uebung in Musik' since 1900?) always occupied with the aim

to base the structure of my music consciously on a unifying idea, which produced not only all the other ideas but regulated also their accompaniment and the chords, the harmonics."

This is true not only for Schoenberg's later atonal works, but also

3
for his earlier tonal compositions, ^{(especially} for instance the first string quartet and the Chamber-symphony. Yet, of course, the unifying idea was ~~needed~~ needed more than ever in the keyless atonal region. Before it was found, the atonal composers were mostly limited to very short pieces. It was not possible to unify larger extensious without the means of tonality. The unifying idea which was elaborated nearly twenty years after the first atonal experiments is the twelve-tone-technique.

It is very interesting that Schoenberg did not use the new technique at once in order to try out really new formal concepts. It seems to me that even now his mind is still occupied with the possibilities of restoring the sonata-form within the new idiom and by using his new technique. Anyway, the most important works of his later period, like the Quintet for wind instruments, the Third and Fourth string quartets and as I presume also his just finished Violin Concerto show different approaches to the sonata-form. So I do not know his theoretical standpoint in this matter I can not say that I disagree with him. But I should say that I do not believe that the real values and the specific ^{faculty} ~~abilities~~ of the twelve-tone-technique are ~~not~~ entirely exploited by this kind of formal ideas. Besides these efforts to reestablish the sonata-form Schoenberg tried to revive some other old forms. I will show ^{you} as an example the minuet of his piano-suite op. 25. (E) Of course, the ^{formal} ~~intention~~ ~~underlying~~ ~~to~~ this piece is fully realized, there can be no objection against. But it seems to me that the structural peculiarities due to the application of the twelve-tone-technique are much more important than the realization of the minuet-scheme. The strict and most elaborated use of the different patterns of the series leads to a great deal of intricate contrapuntal relations and accords quite different from the kind of accords existing between the elements of a tonal piece. (E) Of course, the composer proved ~~that~~ it is possible to ~~really~~ realize the minuet-scheme by using this technique although at least the minuet-character might be called somewhat distorted. But it seems to me that more could be won for the innovation of the formal ~~ideas~~ ideas by following ~~just~~ just those structural relations and accords without being haunted by outmoded formal schemes.

Schoenberg himself made different efforts in this way, especially in his Variations for orchestra, op. 31. Myself, occupied with the twelve-tone-technique since about six years, I chose too the variation-form in order to try out some new formal idea. It seems to me that the variation-form altogether is somehow the basic formal concept of this style, because of repeating the idea of the ever transformed basic patterns on a larger scale. The formal idea of my Piano-Variations is the following: (E) of course, there will be a great deal of other possibilities of deriving new formal concepts from the peculiarities of the structure offered by the twelve-tone-technique. It seems to me that this proceedings are promising enough because the main idea of the sonata-form was also derived from the structural qualities of tonality as I pointed out before.

I believe that on the one hand there is behind the twelve-tone-technique some spiritual background which would remain neglected if one would try to apply this technique on traditional formal

shows by using it as a so-to-speak ready-made device. Just when Schoenberg says he was looking for a new unifying idea I think that such an idea claims more and other things than the remodeling of classical forms which has been unified enough by its own means. On the other hand I believe it would be to consider the twelve-tone-technique only as a special case of realizing this new unifying idea, although the most systematically ~~elaborated~~ elaborated feature of that idea. ^(up to now) Yet it seems to me that this ^(very) idea covers a larger field than that which is filled today by the twelve-tone-technique.

For my opinion the curve of the development goes from the first examples of such relations as I showed in the trans-piece of Schoenberg to the high degree of ~~complexity~~ completion and severity reached in the twelve-tone-technique. But when we learned to use all implications of this technique for the enlargement of our formal concepts we should be able to proceed to a more conscious freedom in handling the new material without losing the unifying idea, on the contrary, in applying it in a more refined and flexible ^{manner.} ~~way~~ ^{Yet,} anyway the twelve-tone-technique will remain the most suitable means for teaching ~~the~~ composition in the new idiom, in furnishing a logically connecting link between the old counterpoint and the apparently boundless ^(the strict limitations of) freedom of ~~the~~ atonality.

the unifying idea is to be seen in the establishment of most dense and rich contrapuntal relations between the single elements of a keyless, atonal music, and