Chez Pétrouchka: Harmony and Tonality chez Stravinsky
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In an appreciative comment on Pieter van den Toorn’s recent study of Stravinsky,1 Stephen Walsh remarks that thanks to the work of van den Toorn, Arthur Berger, and some others, we are now beginning to approach the stage of possessing a “background theory” for describing and understanding Stravinsky’s harmonic mechanisms, “such as we take for granted when we discuss tonal music.”2 Around Stravinsky’s music, in other words, there is at last a growing literature that begins to fulfill Berger’s prediction-cum-demand for a “new branch of theory” that is equipped “to deal with the nature of twentieth-century music that is centric (i.e. organized in terms of tone center) but not tonally functional,”3 in a way that transcends the purely statistical, inductive, or ad hoc (read: hit-or-miss) methods that have served in the past. Elsewhere I have argued that proper attention to the historical dimension is necessary if we are ever to be able to measure Stravinsky’s achievement against a relevant context of common practice—something I conceive as an essential component of any “background theory”—and have made some attempt to provide such a context by describing the historical

1The Music of Igor Stravinsky (New Haven, 1983).
The evolution of certain aspects of Stravinsky’s harmonic and tonal idiom. Now it is time to attempt a couple of further steps, both as the logical extension of the progress made thus far, and in answer to some legitimate objections that have been raised to van den Toorn’s work.

The background theory in question locates the source of many of Stravinsky’s most characteristic harmonic and tonal practices in a predisposition toward symmetrical partitions of the octave, most often involving the use of the “octatonic” scale (so christened, I believe, by Berger, and now the generally accepted term for a referential pitch collection that may be represented as a ladder of alternating tones and semitones). But it has been observed that up to now no critic has managed to analyze any complete Stravinsky composition along these lines, in such a way as to account for the long-range direction and coherence we now routinely demand to be shown in analyses of tonal or serial pieces. Too often the analysis merely establishes local referability to the octatonic collection, along, perhaps, with a description of various partitioning devices. Joseph Straus, in a prominent review of van den Toorn’s work, has laid particular stress in this methodological shortcoming:

Selecting a short passage (usually under twenty measures in length), he extracts its pitch content as an unordered, unregistered, un rhythmicized collection of notes, then identifies the collection as representative of one of the three octatonic collections, one of the diatonic collections, or some amalgamation of the two. Finally, in a multi-level display, he shows the partitioning of these collections.5

As far as it goes, this is an accurate description of van den Toorn’s method. But of course to show partitioning is to establish something beyond mere referability. The way in which certain partitions crop up time and again suggests the existence of routines, which in turn suggest a common practice, which can in turn be shown to have historical precedent. Van den Toorn quite explicitly identifies three such octatonic routines: \( [0 3 6 9] \) symmetry, meaning a matrix or axis of triadic roots (potential tonal centers) a minor third apart; the partitioning of the collection into \( [0 2 3 5] \) minor tetrachords, again available at each of the \( [0 3 6 9] \) nodes, but with strong preference shown for the \( [0 6] \) tritone relationship that exhausts the collection; finally, with particular reference to Stravinsky’s neoclassic period, the partitioning of the collection into \( [0 3 7 / 0 4 7] \) major-minor triadic interactions.6 Further Stravinskian routines specified by van den Toorn include the interaction of the \( [0 2 3 5] \) partition with the “D scale” (Dorian) and that of the \( [0 3 7 / 0 4 7] \) partition with the “C-scale” (major) diatonic modes; this provides an excellent lens for viewing Stravinsky’s stylistic progress from the “Russian” to the neoclassic phases of his career. And finally, van den Toorn makes some compelling generalizations about the differing properties of the \( (1, 2) \) ordering of the scale (“Model A”) and the \( (2, 1) \) ordering (“Model B”). These are already considerable achievements.

Still, the fact that his analyses are as a rule confined to short passages has given rise to skepticism as to the explicative power of these analytical models, and the continued hope that a key to Stravinsky’s tonal (or centric) system may yet lie in “a wildly Schenkerian-derived kind of theory of pitch-class set ‘prolongation’ in various pitch-structural and rhythmstructural ‘levels’.”7 Another shortcoming often adduced is the fact that beyond a rather pragmatic flexible notion of ad hoc “octatonic/diatonic interactions,” no one has come up with a satisfactory means of taking “chromaticism” into account. That is, there lacks a firm means of accounting for pitches not present in a given

---


3The numbers within the parentheses are those of the degrees of the chromatic scale, with an arbitrary starting point at zero. The method, first used in the analysis of serial music, has the advantage of enabling the “ideal” conceptualizing of intervals without their embodiment in actual pitch classes, to say nothing of register.

octatonic collection within a context that is generally referable to the collection. As Straus has put it, van den Toorn “never tries to distinguish between structural and embellishing pitches or to account for a sense of directed motion from point to point.”

Never is rather a strong word, but this is indeed an aspect of the Berger–van den Toorn approach that could use some shoring up. Straus has implied that a van den Toorn analysis of Stravinsky accounts for little more than would an analysis of the “Jupiter” Symphony that merely demonstrated its referability to the “C scale.” The objection is overstated, but its grain of truth is this: just as we get our sense of Mozart’s C major not only from his use of the “C scale on C” but also from the way the “black keys” are related hierarchically to the tones of the scale, so, if we are to be able to conceive of the octatonic collection as a tonality, we must be able to account for the use of the “other” four tones in relation to it.

This neither Berger nor van den Toorn has tried very rigorously to do. On the contrary, by their, it seems, too easy recourse to “diatonic-octatonic interaction” they have given the impression that the octatonic collection in Stravinsky is in point of fact structurally subordinate to the diatonic. Defending himself against Straus’s strictures, van den Toorn has even admitted that “there are no works by Stravinsky which are wholly octatonic in conception.” If by this he means that there is no work by Stravinsky every note of which is referable to a single octatonic collection, then his statement is true. But by that token one would be hard put to come up with a composition by Mozart that is “wholly diatonic in conception,” since even the simplest minuet or sonatina movement will contain tones foreign to the C scale that defines its key. If, on the other hand, the concept of octatonicism is broadened sufficiently to encompass what we normally have in mind when we speak of a diatonic key, then I believe there are Stravinsky works that are essentially, if not “wholly” octatonic in conception.

To be sure, an octatonic tonality will never be precisely analogous to a diatonic key, since the structure of the collection precludes the exclusive a priori hierarchical dominance of a single pitch class. Nonetheless, there are Stravinsky compositions in which an octatonic complexe sonore (to borrow, after Berger, a useful term from the Poétique musicale) is maintained as a stable point of reference governing the whole span of a composition, whatever the vagaries or digressions along the way.

The second tableau of Petrushka [Chez Pétrouchka] is such a composition, and I propose to attempt an analysis of the entire piece based on what has been learned up to now of the common practice out of which Stravinsky emerged, plus what has been established thus far in terms of “background theory” to Stravinsky’s “harmonic mechanisms,” amplifying or augmenting the latter as necessary to accomplish the job.

---

8Review of van den Toorn, p. 132.
9Indeed, van den Toorn’s lengthier analyses of pieces such as Le Sacre du printemps, Les Noces, L’Histoire du soldat, the Symphony in Three Movements, and Agon cannot be said to ignore directed motion through structural pitch hierarchies. He does show frequently how one Stravinskian “block” leads to another, how priority is established by preserved connecting links and registra]ly fixed pitches. See, for example, his discussion of E♭, and later, E♭ and C, as structural tones governing the progress of Le Sacre from the beginning of the Augures printanières through the end of the Jeu de rapi;—a lengthy span indeed [The Music of Igor Stravinsky, pp. 102ff.]. Van den Toorn’s ex. 27, which by the way extends through twenty pages[[1]], takes in great chunks of the first tableau of Stravinsky’s ballet and interrelates them impressively (see, for summary, the charts in his ex. 29 on p. 123).
12This is something to which Straus evidently cannot reconcile himself. He complains that van den Toorn “never establishes workable criteria for asserting the priority of a single pitch class in a given passage of music” (p. 133). But the failing, if such it be, is not the analyst’s, it is the failing of the collection [not to say the composer]. To think that a single pitch class must always be assertable in this way within any “centric” situation is an arbitrarily restrictive condition that equates out of preconception what Berger was careful to distinguish in the passage quoted near the beginning of this essay, and renders the whole quest for a Stravinskian “background theory” futile. [It seems to be an identifiable “Yale” position; see the remarks by Forte quoted and discussed below.] Van den Toorn, like any unprejudiced observer, recognizes that pitch-class priority in an octatonic situation—or, to be precise, in Stravinsky’s [0 3 6 9] symmetrically partitioned octatonic situations, where by definition there are four potential tone centers—can only be asserted contextually. See The Music of Igor Stravinsky, pp. 178–79, or his “Letter to the Editor,” pp. 323–25.
13Perspectives on Schoenberg and Stravinsky, p. 137.
Both Berger and van den Toorn have made pertinent and valuable observations about *Chez Pétrouchka*. To Berger we owe the first analysis of the illustrious "Petrushka chord" that "subsumed [it] under a single collection with a single referential order, i.e. the octatonic scale, [so that] the dubious concept of 'polytonality' need no longer be invoked."¹⁴ But beyond such purely operational observations Berger was not prepared to go: "it is not the intention . . . to make exalted claims for this scale, but rather, to observe its behavior in such concrete manifestations as the 'Petrushka chord'."¹⁵ In particular, Berger held back from positing the scale as an a priori concept for Stravinsky, granting it no more than an inferential, and therefore provisional, analytical status. Van den Toorn went some distance toward demonstrating Stravinsky's "in-the-act awareness" of the collection and its "referential implications" when he noted that when the "Petrushka chord" reappears along with Petrushka himself at the end of the third tableau of the ballet (Ⅲ), it "features the (6) tritone-related (4 7) triadic subcomplex not at C and F# but at the remaining two (3 6 9) symmetrically defined partitioning elements of Collection III, E♭ and A♭" which exhausts the collection of reference and suggests that it did in fact possess for Stravinsky an a priori conceptual status [see ex. 1].¹⁶ Van den Toorn also took the first steps toward demonstrating that the concept had been imparted to Stravinsky by Rimsky-Korsakov.¹⁷ His main historical point was that Stravinsky was the first to combine (3 6 9) symmetrical triadic derivations from the octatonic collection vertically, as simultaneities [his redoubtable "polytonalisms," of which the "Petrushka chord" is the most famous]. "The distance separating [Rimsky] from *Petrushka* suddenly becomes enormous," he comments.¹⁸

But in fact the difference remains one of degree [of harmonic boldness and voice-leading freedom] rather than kind. By understanding the origins of Stravinsky's triadic-symmetrical octatonicism in Rimsky-Korsakov's work and teaching, one can distinguish his "Petrushka chord" from the ones in Ravel's *Jeux d'eau* (1901), for example, or in Strauss's *Elektra* (1908), which have very different historical backgrounds and different functional explanations, but which an analyst unarmed with historical perspective might be tempted to adduce as precedents for Stravinsky's usage.

There is, in fact, at least one forerunner to the *Petrushka* chord within the particular sphere of theory and practice that gave rise to Stravinsky's. It is found in Maximilian Steinberg's *Symphonic Prelude* in memory of Rimsky-Korsakov (1908), which was a companion piece to Stravinsky's own *Chant funèbre* in memory of his teacher, the one important Stravinsky composition that is lost to posterity. What is especially remarkable about Steinberg's passage, which combines major triads on B and F, and consequently refers to what van den Toorn calls "Collection II," is that it is one of three passages in his *Prelude* that quote from his father-in-law's own sketches for a work he had in progress at the time of his death: an oratorio ["Heaven and Earth"] after Byron [see ex. 2]. Rimsky's explicit reference in these sketches to the "interstices" provides the octatonic "background theory" for the Stravinsky usage demonstrated in ex. 1.¹⁹

Thus it would appear that by the time he died, Rimsky-Korsakov had traveled a longer journey down the octatonic path than he is normally credited with, and hence that the congruence between his octatonic "routines" and those of his most eminent pupil extends at least

---

¹¹Ibid., pp. 134–35.
¹²Ibid., p. 138.
¹³The Music of Igor Stravinsky, p. 463, n. 5. Van den Toorn numbers the three possible transpositions of the octatonic scale with Roman numerals, and we will follow him here, even though I wish he had called this collection [which contains the C-major triad as a constituent of its complexe sonore] no. 1.
¹⁴See his discussion of Rimsky's *Sadko* and Stravinsky's *Scherzo fantastique* as background to *Petrushka* and beyond, pp. 35–39.
¹⁵Ibid., p. 37.
¹⁶The Rimsky sketch has been published in a supplemental volume to his complete works: N. A. Rimsky-Korsakov, Polnoe sobranie sochinenii: Literaturnye proizvendeniya i perepisiska IV (dop.): Notnye zapisanye knizhki [Moscow: Muzyka, 1970], p. 277. Steinberg's prelude was published in the author's reduction for piano by Edition Belaieff [Leipzig, 1910]. The citations from Heaven and Earth sketches are set forth with asterisks.
as far as the second tableau in Petrushka. It is my contention here that Chez Pétrouchka [conceived originally, as everyone knows, as an independent Konzertstück for piano and orchestra in the late summer of 1910], is based on a complexe sonore consisting of an \{0 3 6 9\} symmetrical partitioning of “Collection III,” according to what was a fully elaborated St. Petersburg common practice, established by Rimsky, handed down to all his pupils, and fully described in my earlier historical study.\(^{20}\) Example 3 reproduces a chart given in that essay, which originally accompanied an analysis of the opening of the second scene [the Underwater Kingdom] in Rimsky’s opera Sadko of 1897 (also touched on by van den Toorn\(^{21}\)).

\(^{20}\)See n. 4 above.

\(^{21}\)The Music of Igor Stravinsky, pp. 36–37, including ex. 15a.
Another Rimskian technique traced in the earlier article, one that also has a bearing on Stravinsky’s usages in Chez Pérouchka, consists in the alternating or even simultaneous use of the {1, 2} and {2, 1} orderings of the octatonic scale arranged around the same set of {0 3 6 9} symmetrical nodes. Following Rimsky’s explicit and demonstrable usage, these are labeled “harmony scale” (the 1, 2 ordering) and “melody scale” (the 2, 1 ordering; see ex. 4). Rimsky’s habit was to derive the harmony of a given passage from the {1, 2} ordering and the melody from the {2, 1} ordering, as in ex. 5, also from Sadko. In this way the entire chromatic could be employed within an explicit octatonic framework. This passage was actually discussed by Rimsky-Korsakov with his disciple Vasilii Yastrebtsen, in such a way that we may be sure our analysis of it follows his conscious practice.22

Before proceeding, let us consider the special status of the French sixth chord within Rimsky’s harmonic practice, for this is something previous writers have not mentioned. Just as any one of the triads or (particularly) dominant-seventh chords referable to the octatonic complexe sonore can provide a pivot for modulation to a diatonic scale, so the French sixth {0 4 6 10}, like the tritone {0 6} itself, can act as a bridge between the octatonic collection and the whole-tone scale {0 2 4 6 8 10}, another “mode of limited transpositions” (to use Messiaen’s suggestive term) based on a symmetrical division of the octave {0 4 8}. This scale, too, figures prominently in the Russian “fantastic chromaticism” that forms the immediate background to Stravinsky’s harmonic idiom in Petrushka.23 Chord formations based on the whole-tone collection interact spectacularly with octatonic formations in the second act of Rimsky’s Le Coq d’or, to mention a famous example. Moreover, it is a commonplace of Scriabin’s harmonic practice to partition the French sixth chord into two “incomplete” dominant sevenths a tritone apart, often within an explicitly octatonic frame of reference.24 If these partitioning chords are completed by the addition of their thirds, the Petrushka chord is the result.

The theoretical models thus far expounded

22See “Chernomor to Kashchey,” pp. 79ff.

23For a tracing of its historical evolution in nineteenth-century music, and a demonstration of its original functional congruence with the octatonic collection, see “Chernomor to Kashchei,” pp. 79–99.

24See Varvara Demova, “Garmoniia Skriabina,” in A. N. Skriabin: Sbornik statей, ed. S. Pervinsky (Moscow, 1973), pp. 352–57. For many insightful comments on Scriabin’s use of the French sixth as generator of whole-tone and octatonic collections and as mediator between them, Jay Reise, “Late Skriabin: Some Principles Behind the Style,” this journal 6 (1983), 220–31. Reise also has useful things to say about the handling of “chromaticism” within whole-tone and octatonic contexts.
Example 4

Example 5: Sadko, act I, sc. 2, \( \text{Ex. 4} \).

were derived in the first instance from an analysis of the Underwater Act in Sadko, chosen for this purpose because Rimsky had discussed it theoretically to some limited extent with Yan-trebtsin. There is every reason to assume that Stravinsky knew that music intimately; it was performed by Diaghilev's company, as a matter of fact, during the same Paris season that saw the premiere of Petrouchka. But if an immediate and historically demonstrable forebear to Chez Pérouchka is required, it can easily be found in another of the many Rimsky-Korsakov compositions that embody these procedural norms: the symphonic suite Shéhérazade, op. 35, the hoariest Rimskian chestnut of them all.

Now why should this work of 1888 have been a more direct stimulus on the imagination that produced Petrouchka than the opera Sadko of 1897, not to mention any of the later fantastic operas, from Kashchei the Deathless to Le Coq d'or, that were actually composed or revised during the period of Stravinsky's tutelage? The reason is that Shéhérazade, choreographed by Fokine to a scenario by Benois, and with epoch-making sets and costumes by Bakst, had been, along with the Firebird, the other succès fou of the Diaghilev saison russe of 1910. The two works frequently shared the boards, and in any case, Stravinsky still had vivid memories of the ballet as late as 1958, when he described it to Robert Craft—at least with respect to Bakst's contribution—as a masterpiece.\(^{25}\) He heard Rimsky's score any number of times, then, in June and July of 1910, and he began work on the Konzertstück that would become Chez Pérouchka in late August or September. There can be little doubt that it was Shéhérazade that got Stravinsky thinking again in terms of strict \(\{0,3,6,9\}\) octatonic symmetry, something of which there is actually rather little in The Firebird. (That ballet is based to a very large extent on a special "ladder of thirds" technique Stravinsky had derived from octatonic practices, but which transcended them.) The example of Shéhérazade reminded Stravinsky that there was, to paraphrase Schoenberg, "still a great deal to be said in C major"—or, to be precise, in Collection III with a strong initial orientation on C, and with a good deal of diatonic and whole-tone contamination.

Shéhérazade contains a number of striking passages in which the \(\{0,6\}\) octave-bisecting tritone relationship is strongly asserted. The very

\(^{25}\)Igor Stravinsky and Robert Craft, Conversations with Igor Stravinsky [Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1980], p. 97.
opening is a case in point. The successive downbeats of Sultan Shahriar's four-bar motive sound a descending whole-tone scale through the fourth degree, that is, the midpoint (see ex. 6). In the middle of the first movement of the suite, the first three notes of the theme are broken off from the rest and treated in a typically Rimskian sequential progression that covers the same distance, but in an octatonic (Collection III) progression. In ex. 7, all tones foreign to Collection III are circled. They will be seen to be conventional appoggiaturas, an important precedent to recall in connection with Chez Pétrouchka.

In the middle of the second movement, the Shahriar motive in its full four-measure form is linked with a passage that seems to stand midway between the famous bell-ringing progression in Boris Godunov, with its oscillating tone-related dominant-seventh chords, and the cries of Petrushka. In ex. 8, the [0 6] limits of the Shahriar theme are filtered out, as Berger might say, and held as a pedal while the trumpet and trombone play their antiphonal fanfares. The latter are derived from the third measure of the theme. Their starting notes, heard pretty ineluctably as roots of dominant sevenths à la Mussorgsky, are pitched a tritone apart, as per the implied harmony of the third and fourth measures of the theme (cf. ex. 6b). These fanfares, by the way, show Rimsky-Korsakov thinking, as early as 1888, in terms of an embryonic octatonically referable "polytonalism," for the fanfare figures outline minor triads, the thirds of which contradict the pedal tritone (Fb in the trombone against the F; Bb in the trumpet against the B). The clashing pitches, no less than the invariant ones, are full-fledged members of the Collection III complexe sonore. Rimsky's particular harmonic filtering of that complex—the "common tritone" pedal plus the emphasized fourths in the brass fanfares—yield that contents of the Petrushka chord. It is plausible, moreover, that Rimsky's fanfare figures provided a model for the opening phrases of Chez Pétrouchka: Rimsky's opening fourth is inverted to a fifth, and there is the same use of triplet upbeats containing passing tones foreign to the octatonic collection in force, but which are prepared and resolved in a fully conven-

Example 6
Rimsky’s passage (ex. 8a) continues. The “common tritone” is resolved in one of the two ways possible: “inward,” to C [the “outward” resolution would have been to F♯]. The F♯ is quickly provided through a sequencing of the
a. *Shéhérazade*, II, 9 after D

![Music notation](image)

b. Reduction and analysis
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c. Rimsky's theme compared with Stravinsky's

![Music notation](image)

Example 8

A triplet figure from the brass fanfares, and the new tritone, C–F♯, replaces the old as a pedal for a sequential repetition of the whole passage described in the last paragraph. This time the antiphonal-fanfares idea is developed through fragmentation and an accelerated harmonic rhythm (shades, again, of those *Boris* bells), until it is time for the inevitable contrapuntal combination of the Shahriar theme and the fanfare theme. Rimsky achieves this through a common-tone progression in which the fanfare passage, centered on A, is repeated endlessly,
with the A progressively redefined as root, third, seventh, and fifth. This passage ought to be quoted (ex. 9) since in it Rimsky hammers away at the phrase that seems to have been echoing in Stravinsky's ear (and no wonder) as he began his *Konzertstück* in 1910. And the passage it leads to at the end of ex. 9 also reverberates in *Petrushka*: the three clarinet cadenzas
over static harmonies provided the model for the big cadenza bar (one before \( \text{m.} 52 \)) in Chez Pétrouchka, where the same clarinet, immediately aped by the piano, holds forth in virtuosic cascades over a sustained harmony in the cellos.\(^{27}\) Rimsky’s cadenza passage, moreover, following \( \text{m.} 6 \), is exclusively and exhaustively octatonic, referable to Collection III. The harmonies of the second and third bars, in fact, sum up the exact contents of the Petrushka chord. As a progression they adumbrate what might be called (with apologies to Siegmund Levarie) the “tonal flow” of Chez Pétrouchka, which begins with a passage centered on C and ends with a cadence on F\#.\(^{28}\)

III

This observation is the first step toward an understanding of Petrushkian tonality. The \( \{0, 6\} \) C/F\# tritone polarity exists not only in the vertical conjunction that has become so famous, but is extended in the temporal dimension to govern the overall tonal coherence of the music. And—shades of Shéhérazade!—the \( \{0, 6\} \) polarity exists in an important tonal sense as a subset both of the octatonic and of the whole-tone collections, between which it represents the point of intersection. As an expression of the midpoint of the whole-tone collection it provides a frame for the modulatory plan of the movement, which, though rather rigorously octatonic in its referential ordering through \( \text{m.} 8 \), is nonetheless centered through \text{m.} 42 on C, as will be demonstrated below. The Adagietto at \( \text{m.} 8 \) is centered on D and carries a signature of two sharps, while the music from \( \text{m.} 8 \) to \( \text{m.} 15 \) has E at its center. (From \( \text{m.} 8 \) to \( \text{m.} 15 \) the key signature of E minor is actually employed.) As noted above, the final cadence is on F\#. Thus the sequence of tonal centers forms an ascending octave-bisecting whole-tone progression C–D–E–F\#, which mirrors the descending progression so suggestively embodied in the Shahriar leitmotif from Shéhérazade (ex. 10).

\(^{27}\)It might be argued that a model nearer Stravinsky lay in the first movement of Ravel’s Rapsodie espagnole; but Rimsky was Ravel’s model, too, and, as pointed out above, no piece was closer to Stravinsky than Shéhérazade right before he embarked on his Konzertstück.

\(^{28}\)→ Siegmund Levarie, “Tonal Relations in Verdi’s Un Ballo in maschera,” this journal 2 (1978), 143–47.
an octatonic center] is applied to it as an acciacatura, restating on a more structural plane the local resolution of D♯–E in m. 6. The whole passage is given in ex. 11, with tones foreign to Collection III circled, as in the Shéhérazade excerpt above. (See also the Sadko excerpt analyzed in “Chernomor to Kashchei,” ex. 22.) As in Rimsky’s compositions, all the foreign pitches are applied to Collection III pitches by means of the most ordinary techniques for handling “nonharmonic” tones: either as passing tones, or, in the case of the chord preceding the French sixth in m. 4, as neighbors, complete [D–E♭] or incomplete [G♭–A, B–C♯].

When the Petrushka chord is first sounded by the clarinet arpeggios in m. 9 (Ex.), the C-major component retains its dominance because it is on top, and also (as Berger noted) because it is in the same stable form it had assumed at the beginning—to which we associate it on rehearing—while the F♯ arpeggio, previously unheard as a discrete harmony, is voiced in its § position, making it more difficult to identify aurally than its companion.

As Berger also pointed out, the “principal defining agency of the total configuration” produced by the pair of clarinet arpeggios is the dyad A♯/C,31 both because it is the high point, and because it is prolonged in notes lasting as much as two measures and more (mm. 10–11, 13–15). Stravinsky capitalizes on this dyad’s property of belonging both to the octatonic and the whole-tone collections that share C/F♯ as their defining [0 6] midpoint, by introducing a figure in the bassoon that completes the whole-tone tetra-chord from C to F#. The foreign tone thus introduced, G♯, is a borrowing such as Rimsky-Korsakov himself might have made from the octatonic “melody scale”: literally a “nonharmonic” tone. It is immediately contradicted by the first clarinet’s “harmonic” G♯ in m. 12, and then [m. 16] resolved indirectly—that is, through a diminished-seventh arpeggio consisting of all the potential centers of Collection III—to A, the one Collection III nodal point that has not been heard up to now, however briefly, as a chord root. It is sounded in m. 16 only as a sixty-fourth note, but it is a functional root nonetheless, for it immediately picks up a third and a seventh, C♯/G, the latter pitch introduced by the bassoon’s G♯, now given to the muted trumpet, as appoggiatura: the melody scale gives way to the harmony scale.32 The C♯/G tritone now transiently assumes the status of focal point. It is a far weaker one than C/F♯ had been, since its constituent pitches are not available as triadic roots within the Collection complexe sonore. Its main function is to provide a pair of thirds—or, in Rimskian terms, a “common tritone”—for the roots E♭ [D♯]–A, which fill in the interstices between the C and F♯ of Collection III. This happens in mm. 21 and 22. The cascades in the piano part are a kind of composed-out Petrushka chord, reminiscent of the complex arpeggio figuration in Stravinsky’s Fireworks, op. 4, and, indeed, constructed according to methods Stravinsky had worked out in composing that piece. There, a complex whole-tone-derived chord [one that appears prominently in Le Coq d’or] had been slyly resolved as a sort of inverted augmented-sixth chord to a more stable dominant-seventh harmony as shown in ex. 12.

The same kind of multiple voicings and resolutions operate in the Petrushka cascade. Both the precedent set in Fireworks, and the fact that half of the cascade is repeated independently [by the clarinet] in m. 22, suggest that the ten-note cascade is to be heard as two groups of five. The first of these exhibits a very clear neighbor progression to the dominant seventh on D♯/E♭ [ex. 13a]; the second is a more abstruse progression that relies, for its interpretation, on the precedent set in mm. 3–4 [ex. 13b]. The basic harmony is a fifthless dominant seventh on A, which together with the D♯ harmony yields the content of the Petrushka chord.

The extraordinary passage adumbrated in m. 19,

---

31Perspectives on Schoenberg and Stravinsky, p. 136.

32The use of a perfect fifth as dissonant appoggiatura to a stable diminished fifth has ample precedent in Rimsky-Korsakov. See “Chernomor to Kashchei,” pp. 114–15.
and developed fully beginning in m. 23, shows that despite the octatonic interpretation of its genesis, there may be some validity after all in regarding the *Petrushka* chord as a polytonalism. In m. 19 the C#/G tritone generates another burst of arpeggios, in which the piano joins (or rather, opposes) the clarinets. The latter confine themselves to the C-major and F#-major triads as before [the G and C# of the generating tritone assuming the identity of chordal fifths]. The piano right hand, however, builds a triad from the root G to clash against the F# arpeggio in the left hand. This G-major arpeggio, which borrows two tones from outside Collection III, could be looked upon as an appoggiatura to the F# arpeggio, following the many neighbor-note precedents already established in *Chez Pérouchka*. Another way of looking at the chord would be simply to regard it as the dominant of the first clarinet’s C-major arpeggio. This has the “dramaturgical” advantage of casting the opposition of piano and orchestra, which we know to have been at the core of the programmatic idea that motivated the *Konzertstück*, into higher relief. It further enhances our sense that C enjoys priority within Collection III, for it alone is licensed to import auxiliary harmonies from outside the octatonic field.

At any rate, the application to C of its conventional diatonic dominant—foreshadowed, one recalls, by the accented B♭ in m. 6—shows that Stravinsky regarded the two triadic subsets of the *Petrushka* chord as potentially independent functional agents. This interpretation is corroborated by many passages later on in the piece [to be noted on their occurrence]; it is therefore the one I favor. During the passage at m. 19—and the one following [mm. 23–26] in which the piano and first clarinet exchange harmonies, the latter taking over the G-major arpeggio, while the piano reverts to C—it seems proper to speak of “music in two keys,” as Stravinsky continued to do throughout his life, so long as it is borne in mind that the keys in question were chosen not at random but from among the circumscribed and historically sanctioned wares of the octatonic *complexe sonore*.

The ensuing passage for the piano—the first of several cadenzas in which, according to the original conception of the *Konzertstück*, the soloist was envisioned as a mad genius in a frac, rolling “objets hétéroclites” up and down the keyboard—combines both G and C chords in the right hand against the F# arpeggio in the left, which by now has taken on the character of a non-harmonic pedal. The white-key / black-key opposition, which plays a role of ever-
creeping prominence in the piano’s rhetoric, is nothing if not “heteroclite.” By the third measure, however, the figuration has been modified so as to conform to the Fireworks-like “cascade” figure heard shortly before [compare m. 29 with m. 21]. Two more white notes—C and F—are added to the pitch repertoire of the piano’s white hand; but more important, the new pitch configuration demands a reinterpretation of the relationship between F♯ and G. The former, up to now a stable element, is heard at this point as an appoggiatura to the latter, until now a mere epiphenomenon. A modulation, in other words, has been effected which implies a new governing tritone: B/F [see ex. 14a]. Sure enough, these very tones are filtered out by Stravinsky and conspicuously prolonged in mm. 31–32 [ex. 14b].

This momentary departure prepares the climactic return of the original uncontaminated Collection III complex at 53, the Malédictions de Pétrouchka. Once again C is asserted as the key of priority, if for no other reason than because the curse itself, blared out by four muted trumpets in unison, fortississimo, is confined for the first five bars to the notes of the C-major triad, and thereafter the notes of the F♯ subset are used exclusively in an ornamental capacity. This concludes the first major section of Chez Pérouchka, if by section we mean a closed tonal span. The essential tonal motion it encloses consists of a double-neighbor relation to the “governing [or common] tritone,” which could be represented graphically as in ex. 15. The tonality-defining progression F/B–F♯/C, which in the present context acts like a dominant proceeding to the tonic, was encountered, one recalls, in precisely this form in Shéhérazade [cf. exs. 8 and 9 above].

Whether or not one accepts all the details of this analysis, the essential point seems clear enough: namely, that the octatonic collection (here, Collection III) satisfies at least some of the criteria of “key,” in that it affords not only a referential vocabulary of pitch classes but also a set of stable structural functions, and that departures from it and returns to it—on various levels from that of local “chromaticism” to that of “modulation”—are possible without compromising its referential integrity. Stravinsky’s methods of effecting departure and return, though necessarily ad hoc to some degree given the novelty of the material, are based, as one might only expect from a pupil of the super-fas-tidious Rimsky-Korsakov, on traditional principles of voice leading in tonal music, principles prominently exemplified in Rimsky’s own works, like Shéhérazade and Sadko. They are both consistent and salient to the ear.

IV

On to the second section, which begins with the surprising resolution of the Pérouchka-chord, two measures before 53, to a strongly voiced D-major triad. This is actually the first complete and uncontaminated triad, in block form and in root position, to be sounded thus far in the course of Chez Pérouchka, so it seems to presage, not another octatonic complexe sonore, but, purely and simply, the key of D.

And such seems to be the case—with one telling exception. The “D major” of the Adagietto at 32 is consistently contaminated by a G♯ in place of the normal fourth degree. This pitch, persistently sounded against the tonic triad, maintains the level of tritone saturation we have by now come to regard as normal for this piece. It would make little sense, though, to try to explain it away by invoking the “Lydian mode.” Nor does this particular “raised fourth” behave in the standard way for such altered degrees. With one apparent exception to be dealt
with later, it is never applied to the fifth degree, but consistently falls back onto the third, both within the main tune and in the piano cascade that interrupts it in m. 48 (ex. 16). Indeed, the note A (the fifth degree) is the one pitch that has been suppressed from the cascade. In short, what we have here is a composing-out of the bassoon’s G♯–F♯ lamentoso motive from mm. 11–15, providing a thematic and an affective link between the sections.

The apparent exception to this generalization as to the behavior of the G♯ comes in m. 49, when it is used to initiate a piano cascade like the ones already heard in mm. 21 and 29 (ex. 17). The meaning of this cascade, though, has little to do with the behavior of the previous G♯s. Instead, it reidentifies the last G♯ as a center in a Petrushka-chord-like deadlock with D, and only enhances the structural importance of the “borrowed” tritone. Moreover, the implied fulcrum of the progression, the “common tritone” that links the D and the G♯ components of the cascade, is the original “tonic” tritone, C–F♯. This is very much like what Rimsky-Korsakov had had in mind when he wrote of his care to govern the tonal relations within his “fantastic” music so that no matter how chromatic and recherché the local context, all is ruled by “the invisible presence of the tonic at all times,” lest the music degenerate into “artistic thoughtlessness and caprice.”

It is evident that Stravinsky inherited this concern.

The piano cascade is immediately echoed in m. 49 by the original perpetrators of the G♯ (the English horn standing in for the bassoon, since the passage in question, in this pre-Sacre composition, must have seemed to Stravinsky to lie too high for that instrument). They repeat the second quinteto a step higher, so that it actually ends on G♯, providing a pivot back to the opening tune (8, Andantino). Here the flute joins in and contradicts the G♯ (m. 53) with a G♮—the piano meanwhile abandoning all Gs in its figuration, sharp or natural—in preparation for the modulation to E minor at 8. Both the preparation of this new key and its initial presentation are saturated with double neighbors. These diatonic neighbors reflect, on the surface level, the chromatic structural progression we uncovered in examining the first section of Chez Petrouchka.

The new tonality is, if not entirely conventional, at least entirely diatonic as far as 8, when some very characteristic Russian chromaticism is applied to it. This again involves the use of ornamental double neighbors (see the piano part, mm. 65–67, where chromatic double neighbors decorate the descending Phrygian line from B to E), and also a variety of passing chromaticism one finds very often in the work of Glinka and the Five, especially when they were writing in an “oriental” vein. Borodin’s Arabian Melody (1881) has a turn of phrase so like the end of the Petrushka passage as almost to suggest itself a model (ex. 18).

The frenzied passage beginning at 8 is harmonically a rather ambiguous one. It starts with a C-major triad, and students of the score may be encouraged to think of that chord as tonic, since the F♯ is removed at this point from the key signature. But the F♯, now specifically signed on each occurrence, persists, the melody continues to center quite obsessively around E (in fact, it is a variant of the tune quoted in ex. 18a), and there are no chord progressions in the vicinity that assert any of the primary functions of C major. The upper-voice E, then, is best construed as a continuing tone center, even though it is not used as a local harmonic root. The pitches that are so used most frequently, on the other hand, are the very ones that had figured in the Borodinesque bass line that accompanied the repeated Es of the melody in ex. 18a. They have been promoted from a purely linear, ornamental status to that of a series of ersatz roots, but their functional status with respect to the static tonic E is unchanged. A reduction of the passage such as the one in ex. 19, similar in appearance to the actual surface of the music in ex. 18a, will make this clear.

---

36Letter to E. M. Petrovsky, 11 January 1903; Sovetskaya muzika [XVI], no. 12 (1952), 69.
a. Chez Pétrouchka, mm. 69–70.

b. Borodin, Arabaskaia melodiia, mm. 33–40.

Example 18

Example 19

At 56 the F♯ is finally cancelled and the harmony begins to pile up diatonic thirds in a fashion that in the context of the complete ballet recalls the end of the Danse russe from the first tableau [though the actual order of composition was the reverse]. The largest of these pile-ups actually incorporates the whole white-key collection, in final summary before octatonicism reasserts itself through a D/F pivot, and with a vengeance [ex. 20]. The cadenza bars are based on octatonic Collection I, the collection that is missing precisely the C–E♭–F♯–A “tonic matrix” of the opening section. It is partitioned, Scriabinely, into two diminished-seventh chords.37
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no doubt that Stravinsky knew exactly what he was doing here, and that the harmony sustained by the trumpets and then the solo cellos consists precisely of the collection of those pitches that are foreign to the collection on which the piece commenced, and to which it will return. A position has been assumed at a maximum distance from the tonic matrix, and it has been assumed deliberately.
Just as in the case of the two triads that add up to the Petrushka chord, the two diminished sevenths here are obsessively and grotesquely made to clash as a polychord. The ad libitum cadenza cascades in clarinet and piano treat the diminished-seventh complex B♭—G—E—C♯ as a vast appoggiatura to the sustained harmony. The lowest pitch in the cascades is the B♭, part of the sustained harmony [i.e., a “chord tone”], to which the clarinet descends from its high B♭ in a rush, and which it then sustains for whole beats at a time, leaving no doubt that it is the “structural” pitch. Repeatedly the clarinet takes flight into the appoggiatura region, only to be dragged back to the B♭.

The last ascent breaks free of the cellos’ gravitational field, however, and the clarinet concludes with the very striking sigh figures, on E and C♯, which Stravinsky marks lamentoso assai. This is the one really “atonal” sounding moment in the composition, since the octatonic collection has been partitioned here into mutually exclusive elements, neither of which can function as a tonic sonority in common practice.

The piano immediately tries to duplicate the clarinet’s feat, and makes it as far as the high C♯, which it pounds seven times in a vain effort to break through to the E. Failing to accomplish this, it comes plummeting down to the B♭ where it had started. The B♭ is taken up by the English horn in seeming mockery of the piano’s efforts. The B♭ is then maintained by the English horn as a kind of pedal-pivot against the piano’s activity, through which a return to the tonic matrix (Collection III) will eventually be vouchsafed. Here we can try to make a long story short. As soon as the English horn has entered, the piano repeats and extends the cascade discussed above, illustrated in ex. 14. The extension consists of an extra quintolet inserted between the two original members of the cascade, which recapitulates the harmonic content of the Adagietto at 40. The effect of the middle quintolet is to add D and A to the B–F tritone that underlies the cascades to create a complex of tones that will eventually resolve to the tonic matrix [ex. 21].

The biggest “heteroclite” white-key / black-key roulade now begins, this time rather consistently accompanied by other instruments that ferret out its structural pitches. The harp in the measure before 40 does the best job of this, picking out all the Bs and Fs, the right hand of the piano filling out the white-key component with the aforementioned Ds and As to form a half-diminished chord which cries out for resolution to the C of Collection III. When resolution comes, though, it is clouded by suspension. The three notes from the white-key component of the roulade that make up the D-minor triad ([filtered out and obsessively arpeggiated no fewer than nine times in succession in mm. 94–98] are filtered out again from the half-diminished chord in the last descending cascade and applied as an appoggiatura to the C-major component of the Petrushka-chord at 40.

The trumpets, blaming their fanfare of Petrushka’s despair just as they did in the first section [40], now reinforce the appoggiatura progression with arpeggios on both the D-minor and C-major triads. At 40 the complete half-diminished chord is applied to the C-major triad in the pianist’s right hand, doubled by the cornets and trumpets, fortississimo. The F♯ triad, confined to the piano left hand and the string tremolo that mixes the two triads, can hardly be called the equal partner of the C triad any longer. When the last progression [half-diminished seventh to C major] is repeated by the horns in the next measure (m. 108), the F♯ component of the Petrushka chord is dropped altogether, replaced in the accompanying bassoon by a G, which completes a dominant ninth whose resolution to C [albeit in 3 position] suggests that the F♯ triad has been vanquished by the C, or that the diatonic collection has vanquished the octatonic.

Or—to put it in terms of the 1910 Konzertstück as Stravinsky described its scenario years later—that the orchestra has vanquished the ostreperous “heteroclite” at the keyboard. The whole passage is summarized in ex. 22.40

The triumph, however, is fleeting. Like the eventual ghost of Petrushka himself, the Petrushka chord suddenly “comes to” in the same pair of clarinets that gave it birth (mm. 108–111)—up an octave in fact, alive and kicking. The F♯, seizing its chance, dragoons its old associate G♯—recall the original Petrushka-chord passage at 40—into providing it with a preparation. The G♯ arrives with the rest of “its” triad

38The device is repeated [transposed down a minor third, at which transposition the octatonic collection is invariant] at the reappearance of the Petrushka music at the end of the third tableau [48]: B minor applied as appoggiatura to the A-major triad that is paired with a triad on E♭ to complete the Petrushka harmony.

39On the other hand, Forte in Contemporary Tone Structures [New York, 1955] states flat out that “the tones [of the Petrushka chord] are not of equal structural value; F♯ is by far the more important” (p. 136). If I understand Forte’s analysis aright, it is based on the assumption that “harmonic functions in Petrushka are entirely secondary to the linear movement” (p. 129). The linear movement that establishes F♯ for Forte as primary within the Petrushka complex is one that carries over from the first tableau (see p. 136 and the analytical chart on p. 187). But Chez Pétrouchka was composed before the first tableau and without premonition of it. Therefore, Forte’s explicative construct is based on an ontological fallacy, at least as regards the analysis of Chez Pétrouchka on its own terms.

40The horn—bassoon music in the measure after 40 is so like the garmoshka [concertina] effects in the first and fourth tableaux of the as yet undreamed-of Petrushka, that one has to wonder whether it was a later interpolation. The relevant documents, in particular the 1910 sketchbook for the Konzertstück, are at present in private hands and inaccessible to scholar investigation. See Vera Stravinsky and Robert Craft, Stravinsky in Pictures and Documents [New York, 1978], p. 612, n. 136.
in tow, the formerly triumphant C now transformed into a subservient, enharmonic B#. F# gains the upper hand to end the piece with a cadence—or if not a cadence, at least what van den Toorn would call a suitable “terminating convenience”—that effectively tonicizes the note seemingly left for dead a few measures earlier.

V

I have cast the description of the final pages of Chez Pétrouchka in these blatantly anthropomorphic and academically disreputable terms, because I believe something of the sort was very much on Stravinsky’s mind when he wrote his Konzertstück. His harmony is animistic; the Petrushka chord is conceived, nay motivated, by a sense of struggle, an antagonism of order and chaos reflecting the roles of pianist vs. orchestra. Once again I wish to emphasize that there is practical and poetic—if not “theoretical”—validity in the “polytonal” idea. We are meant to hear C and F♯ in terms of an active, not static, polarity—as competing centers, not merely as docile components of a single, static, octatonically referable “hyper-harmony,” to borrow another apt term from Rimsky-Korsakov’s vocabulary.41 The recognition of the octatonic source of the Petrushka complex was a breakthrough in Stravinsky analysis, and is absolutely essential both to an understanding of the techniques by means of which Chez Pétrouchka was composed, and to a proper assessment of Stravinsky’s stylistic patrimony; still, to go on from there to assert that in consequence, “questions regarding the ‘bitonality’ or ‘polytonality’ of certain passages in [Stravinsky] can no longer be taken seriously,”42 is to commit a genetic fallacy. The end of Chez Pétrouchka shows that the Petrushka chord is more than an embodiment of a tonal stalemate among centers “of equal and thus independent weight.”43 The centers are potentially equal and independent, to be sure, but in the actual composing of the individual piece, the weighting may be unequal indeed. Stravinsky, as heir to traditions of both octatonic and diatonic common practice, felt free to give the component subsets of the Petrushka chord independent diatonic support when it suited his purpose, as it did most spectacularly at the very end of the tableau.

Van den Toorn calls notions of bitonality or polytonality “real horrors of the musical imagination” that have “widely [and mercifully] been dismissed as too fantastic or illogical to be of assistance.”44 He relies on a comment of Allen Forte’s, that polytonality is “a logical contradiction—for a tonality, by definition, requires the ascendancy of a single tone.”45 But this is mere legislative fiat, and in any case, Forte’s definition of tonality here is an operational one, not a “logical” one. To deny the possibility of existence to a phenomenon simply by framing axioms so as to exclude it a priori will no more prevent a composer [Ives, for example, besides Stravinsky] from employing that phenomenon

43Berger, Perspectives on Schoenberg and Stravinsky, p. 137.
44Van den Toorn, p. 64.
45Contemporary Tone Structures, p. 137.
than man's theories of aerodynamics will prevent the bumblebee from flying. Forte's later comment, that "it's better to discard the old terminology of polychords and polyharmonies," since "you end up with something that's neither tonal nor atonal" even more strongly suggests an unwanted apriori in the formulation of his categories.\(^46\)

Van den Toorn objects further that "bitonality" logically implies the "simultaneous (tonally functional) unfolding of two keys," while the Petrushka chord is merely the superimposition of two chords without any implied tonal function.\(^47\) He rejects the contention advanced here, that almost immediately after the initial presentation of the Petrushka chord \(^{48}\) the C-major component is provided with a functional dominant. "In place of initiating a tonally functional definition of the 'key of C-major,' he writes, "the (G B D) triad merely prompts surface tendency-tone behavior on the part of F\(^\#\), A\(^\#\), and C\(^\#\) of the \{F\(^\#\) A\(^\#\) C\(^\#\)\} component in relation to G, B, and D; that is to say, the F\(^\#\) tending to the G, the A\(^\#\) to the B, and the C\(^\#\) to the D."\(^48\)

Leaving aside the question as to whether van den Toorn's invocation of a triple leading-tone relationship does not in fact strengthen the functional status of the G-major chord, I will leave it to the reader to decide whether his analysis accurately describes the voice-leading situation between \(^{49}\) and \(^{50}\). The only spot where, it could be argued, the F\(^\#\) resolves to G, the A\(^\#\) to B and the C\(^\#\) to the D, is in the cascade at \(^{51}\), by which time the G-B-D configuration has been obviously associated with the C-E-G in the opposition of piano and clarinet. The ear has been thoroughly prejudiced to hear the cascade in terms of separate contents of the two hands: a cadential function in the right hand against a constant pedal harmony, or "irritant," in the left. Indeed, the initiation of "a tonally functional definition of the 'key of C-major'" is a self-evident feature of the musical surface, as I hear it, and its careful preparation, beginning at eleven after \(^{52}\), is evidence of the composer's intention. This particular tonicization of C within the Petrushka complex, moreover, is only one of a number of such functional applications, culminating in the ii-I and vii\(^7\)-I progressions to C in \(^{53}\) and \(^{54}\).

Or will it be objected that ii-I is not a viable cadential function? If so, then we have deprived ourselves of any way of understanding the final cadence in the piece: F\(^\#\) major prepared by G\(^\#\) major. We would be in the position of those Rimsky-Korsakov epigones who railed at the incorrectness of Stravinsky's parallel triads. Conversely, if we were to argue that the G\(^\#\)-F\(^\#\) progression is not a tonal cadence because Stravinsky's music, by definition, is "centric . . . but not tonally functional," then we would be in the equally untenable position of denying Stravinsky's connection to a background of common practice, despite his academic schooling at the hands of Rimsky-Korsakov and the latter's pupils. The "background theory," the very breakthrough Walsh and others have justly celebrated, would be sacrificed for the sake of a foolish consistency.

We would also be at a loss to understand perhaps the greatest stroke of genius in Petrushka—the inspired concluding pages of the fourth tableau, in which Petrushka's ghost rears up to jeer at the charlatan. More than once Stravinsky confessed his pride in having authored this music,\(^49\) which takes the interpenetration of the octatonic and diatonic collections to a new level, unprecedented both within the ballet and within the traditions that fed it. The whole twenty-eight-measure passage, from the Lento after \(^{55}\) to the end, consists of a magnificent composing-out of the ii-I progression we are calling cadential, now very explicitly associated with the garmoshka harmonies of the crowd scenes.

At first the D-minor chord is a mere appendage to the C-major triad that emerges from a Petrushka chord, as in the second tableau at \(^{56}\). At \(^{57}\), the C-D oscillation takes on a new dimension. The C chord is given simultaneous upper and lower triadic neighbors, a direct reminiscence of the opening of the fourth tableau (and the end of second, too: the ii and the vii add up to the half-diminished vii\(^7\) at \(^{58}\)). Surprisingly, the

---

\(^46\)See the question-and-answer transcript following Forte, "Ives and Atonality," in An Ives Celebration, ed. H. Wiley Hitchcock and Vivian Perlis [Urbana, 1974], pp. 185–86.

\(^47\)The Music of Igor Stravinsky, p. 64.

\(^48\)Ibid.

\(^49\)Expositions and Developments, p. 137; Memories and Commentaries (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1981), p. 67: "it is obvious to any perceptive musician that the best pages in Petrushka are the last."
whole complex is then jacked up a whole step, as if to tonicize the D. [This had been the tonality at the opening of the tableau, and thus the allusion may have a recapitulatory aspect.] After the two major triads on D and C have gone through another oscillation, each accompanied by its own set of double neighbors, the D complex is sustained. And all at once Petrushka's ghost appears—in a piercing trumpet arpeggio on the notes of the F-minor triad. Now F minor is part of the same octatonic complexe sonore as D major, and this puts the final stamp of certainty (if one is still needed) on Stravinsky's consciousness of the octatonic complex as a referential set. For only by conceptualizing the collection in its typically Rimskian partition would the minor-third relationship have occurred to Stravinsky as a viable substitute for the tritone of the original Petrushka-chord complex.

The ascending F-minor trumpet arpeggio is answered by a descending arpeggio on the notes of the E-major triad, the accompanying garmoshka harmony simultaneously slipping down to the original C major / D minor. As summarized in ex. 23, the whole “apparition” is a muted, varied and harmonically enriched reprise of the “despair” music at Ex. 22 in the second tableau, where the trumpets and cornets had blared their woe in D-minor (ascending) and C-major (descending) arpeggios, while in the accompanying harmony D minor had been applied as an appoggiatura to the C major of the Petrushka chord, the constant F# triad acting as the harmonic glue. In the reprise, we now have an oscillation of two different octatonic complexes—Collection I, which contains the D- and F-minor triads, and which had furnished the harmony for the ad libitum cadenzas in Chez Petrouchka, acting as cadential supertonic to Collection III, the old tonic matrix of Chez Petrouchka. And both collections are made to accommodate diatonic double appoggiaturas (the garmoshka effect) such as was represented by the D-minor triad alone in the second tableau: E minor / C# diminished to D in the Collection I complex, and D minor / B diminished to C in Collection III.

In the orchestral score, the arpeggios (played on transposing instruments) are spelled conventionally within the keys of the transposition. In the contemporaneous piano four-hands reduction, however, Stravinsky's spelling of the arpeggios at Ex. 23 amounts to an analysis. They are spelled F–C#–C and D–G–Bb respectively, in fastidious reflection of their place within their respective octatonic scales. The spelling tips us off that these are embellishing harmonies, to be heard as subordinate to the chords that are provided with diatonic, quasi-cadential neighbors—i.e., D and C, with C enjoying priority by analogy with the second tableau at Ex. 22, as the center of the complex to which the descending arpeggio is applied.

And then, just as in Chez Petrouchka, the hegemony of C is challenged at the last minute by its octatonic antipode F#. This is very adroitly signalled in the four-hands arrangement by means of the peremptory respelling of the C as B# the moment the original Petrushka chord is heard for the last time [six measures before the end]. After one last attempt at resurgence, again accompanied by its attendant supertonic in the horns, the C is finally dislodged by the F# in the final, famously enigmatic [Diaghilev: “But you finish with a question?”] pizzicati. The approach to F# by a direct tritone leap down from C, moreover, mirrors the pizzicato descent from F# by which C has been confirmed as tonic at the very beginning of the “apparition” coda [three before Ex. 22].

In the end, the best one can do, in answer to the question “What is the key of Petrushka?”, is to say “Collection III.” It is more than a collection, though: if key means anything at all, then in this ballet it is a key; for it governs a hierarchy of pitches—contextually established, to be sure, but eminently consistent and regular.

Within *Chez Pétrouchka*, at least, Collection III is a much more stable referent than the transient diatonic collections that supplant it in the middle sections, and in this Stravinsky has neatly reversed the perspective encountered in *Sheherazade*, where the diatonic keys were stable and the octatonic passages fugitive (chiefly "modulatory"). In *Petrushka*, Collection III is a point of harmonic reference from which departures and to which returns are effected by a variety of clearly articulated techniques. And these departures and returns organize very lengthy spans indeed. No, not every pitch in *Petrushka* is referable to it. But then, there are plenty of black keys in the "Jupiter" Symphony.